



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2025

by **Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/24/3358008

12 Bower Road, Hale, Altrincham, WA15 9DT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms H Mitson against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref is 114366/HHA/24.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garage, rear dormer, and chimney breast. Erection of two storey side, single storey front and rear extension and the creation of further habitable living space within the basement and loft. Associated external alterations including formation of rear dormer, roof lights and raised decking to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garage, rear dormer, and chimney breast. Erection of two storey side, single storey front and rear extension and the creation of further habitable living space within the basement and loft. Associated external alterations including formation of rear dormer, roof lights and raised decking to rear, at 12 Bower Road, Hale, Altrincham, WA15 9DT in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 114366/HHA/24, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Numbers: 00100 Revision B; 00105 Revision B; 00110 Revision F; 00800 Revision A; and 00801 Revision A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the South Hale Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling, which is situated in a residential area within the CA. At the time of my site visit, the property was empty and it was clear that it required repair and refurbishment. A detached garage is at the side of the dwelling and the property has a traditional front and rear garden.

4. In the vicinity of the CA, the size, age, and appearance of other dwellings vary. However, there are some common features and characteristics, including bay windows, prominent front-facing gables, a mix of red brick and partial painted render and timber framed porches and verandas. These features make a positive contribution to the architectural and historic significance of the CA. Spaces between the dwellings along Bower Road also vary. Although some of the features listed above apply to the appeal property, the Council states that the dwelling is not regarded as a “positive contributor” to the significance of the heritage asset.
5. Some dwellings along Bower Road have been altered and extended since they were originally built and these include the adjoining semi at number 10, which has been extended at the side and rear, at two and single-storey levels.
6. The appeal proposal is for a number of alterations and extensions to the property, as described in the heading above. It includes the demolition of the existing garage and the removal of a chimney and rear-facing dormer. The existing garage and dormer are of no merit and their loss would not be harmful to the significance of the CA.
7. When determining planning applications for development in conservation areas, it is a statutory requirement that decision makers pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. This requirement is also reflected in Policy R1 of the Trafford Core Strategy and Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the Council’s Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 2024. Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 contains similar provisions.
8. The Council also refers to the guidance contained in the South Hale Conservation Area Management Plan (AMP) and to its Supplementary Planning Document – A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations.
9. The Council considers that the proposal would conflict with the above policies and guidance as it would result in an unsympathetic and visually obtrusive form of development, due to the siting, scale and design of the two-storey side extension, the front roof light, the rear fenestration, and the removal of the rear chimney stack.
10. Whilst the scale and massing of the dwelling would change because of the proposal, I am not persuaded that the impact on the character or appearance of the CA would be harmful. The proposed side extension would reflect the characteristics and design of the host dwelling. Its half-timbered gable feature and the external materials would complement the existing building and the lower roof height would provide a degree of subordination. Although the proposed single-storey garage extension at the front would project in front of the main front wall of the dwelling, its design, and the proposed external materials, including timber side-hung doors, would be in keeping with the character of the dwelling.
11. I note that the proposed roof light at the front of the dwelling would conflict with the guidance contained in the Council’s AMP, but it would be a relatively small and unobtrusive feature that would not detract from the property or have an unacceptable impact on the streetscene.
12. Turning to the spacing between the dwellings, I have noted that the gaps between dwellings vary along Bower Road and the proposal would result in a gap that is narrower than many. However, the retained space would be greater than the

existing space between numbers 10 and 8 and, in my opinion, it would not be at odds with this part of the streetscene.

13. Regarding the proposals at the rear of the property, I note that the Council has no objection to the single-storey addition or to the proposed dormer and the 3 roof lights. I have no reason to disagree with that view. Whilst the fenestration/door details to the ground-floor kitchen area would be different in style and size to the more traditional openings proposed on the rest of the dwelling, they would not be visible from any public viewpoint and I consider that the significance of the heritage asset would not be affected.
14. The proposal would also result in the loss of a chimney stack at the rear of the property. Whilst chimneys are a characteristic of the CA, the stack is not a prominent feature and it is barely visible from Bower Road. As such, it makes little contribution to the heritage value of the CA.
15. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the CA. Consequently, it would not conflict with the provisions of the Development Plan, as referred to above.

Conditions

16. The Council has suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. I have imposed the standard condition relating to the period in which to commence the development. For clarity, a condition specifying the approved plans is also necessary. To ensure a satisfactory external appearance, a condition is imposed requiring the use of matching external materials.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR