



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2025

by K Mansell BA (Hons) MPhil TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3359603

25 Bower Road, Hale, Trafford WA15 9DR

- 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 Mr Chris Hodson against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref is 114290/HHA/24.
 - The development proposed is demolition of the existing detached garage and erection of a two-storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing detached garage and erection of a two storey side and single storey rear extension at 25 Bower Road, Hale, Trafford WA14 9DR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 114290/HHA/24 and the plans submitted with it, 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: 1190-09, 1190-01, 1190-02, 1190-03, 1109-04, 1190-19, 1190-05, 1190-06, 1190-07, 1190-08, 1190-11.
 - 3) The materials that shall be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised on 12 December 2024. Having considered the content of the revisions, it is not necessary to re-consult the main parties about this change in national policy as they do not alter my conclusion.

Main Issue

3. The Council has raised no concerns in respect of the single storey rear extension. From the submitted evidence and my observations on site, I see no reason to disagree with that assessment. Therefore, the matter in dispute relates solely to the proposed two-storey side extension. For this reason, the main issue is:
 - The effect of the two-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and on the South Hale Conservation Area (SHCA).

Reasons

4. Bower Road is a reasonably long tree-lined avenue of mostly detached houses. Whilst the styles and proportions of the properties differ, the broadly consistent building line and vegetated boundaries, the use of mainly red brick and render as facing materials, and architectural features such as front gables, bay windows and decorative porches gives some uniformity to the street. These factors, along with the generously sized plots, gives the road a harmonious and spacious character.
5. The appeal property at No 25 is one of the few semi-detached houses on Bower Road. Architecturally, it incorporates a projecting front gable, an original gabled front dormer and an asymmetrical pitched roof design. A hard surfaced driveway to the side of the house provides access to a garage within the rear garden. The appeal scheme would result in the demolition of the garage and the construction of a two-storey extension to the side, as well as a single storey rear projection.
6. The appeal property, along with all the other properties on Bower Road, lies within Character Area B of the SHCA. S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The boundary of the SHCA as a whole extends to a reasonably large and mainly residential area. Having regard to the Council's SHCA Appraisal and Management Plan Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD5.21 and SPD5.21a) (2017) (SHCA SPD) and my observations on site, it is the generously proportioned tree lined streets, mature frontage landscaping, the distinctive and consistent palette of materials and the high level of architectural detailing to the properties that contribute positively to the character and appearance of the SHCA as a whole, including Character Area B, and thus its special interest and significance.
7. The two-storey side extension would be modest in width in comparison to the frontage and proportions of the original house. It would be generously set back from the principal elevation of the appeal property, and it would appear subservient as a result. Whilst the roof line to the extension would step down from that of the main house, its profile would mirror the irregular pitch of the existing roof. The form of the small, pitched roof front dormer would also be reflective of those already present on the dwelling. Furthermore, being constructed in materials to match the main house, the two-storey extension would be sympathetic to the style, form, features and appearance of the host-dwelling and it would not be visually obtrusive.
8. The extension would conceal part of the chimney breast. However, whilst I observed this detail to other properties along the road, it did not appear to be ubiquitous. Moreover, even though the host property is very slightly angled towards the street, its front elevation broadly aligns with its neighbours, and it does not obviously project forward. As a result, unlike a corner property for example, the extended side elevation would not be unduly prominent and obscuring part of the chimney would not result in an unacceptably discordant addition, particularly as the top of the chimney stack would be retained and remain visible.
9. The Council's SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions & Alterations (2012) (SPD4) advises that a minimum gap of 1 metre should be retained between the side elevation of an extended property and its side boundary. For the most part, the appeal scheme would exceed this guideline, and quite generously at some points. It would only fall just below that width for limited sections towards the rear of the

extension where the perimeter line angles inward. However, when considered in its entirety, the extension would still preserve a clear sense of space to the boundary.

10. I recognise also that the SHCA SPD states that significantly reducing the space between a building and its boundary can be harmful, as it can undermine the balance of green space to built form, being a strong feature of the SHCA. Whilst the appeal proposal would reduce the gap to the side boundary, it would still retain at least 1.5 metres at the front of the extension where it would be most visible from the street. This would provide a meaningful visual separation to the boundary. It would also not be dissimilar to the spacing between double-height flank elevations and boundaries at other properties on the street, including at 14, 14A, and 26 Bower Road. On my site visit, I also observed generally varying gaps between the flank elevations of dwellings along the street and their side boundaries, rather than any consistent pattern. Moreover, the large plot size and long rear garden at No. 25 means that the overall green space would continue to exceed the dwelling's built form. The appeal proposal would not be incongruous as a result.
11. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would be of a scale, massing, design and siting that relates to the appeal property. Consequently, the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the SHCA. It would therefore comply with Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 2022-2039 (2024) and Policy R1 of the Trafford Local Plan Core Strategy (2012). These policies seek, amongst other matters, to ensure high quality contextual development that respects the character of the surrounding area and conserves and enhances the historic environment. It would also comply with guidance within the Council's SPD4 and SHCA SPD, as well as that within the Framework, which generally promote the importance of good design and the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.

Other Matters

12. Concern has been raised by a third-party in respect of land stability and the effect of any proposal on the boundary wall, including future maintenance. This would be a civil matter that does not alter the planning merits of the proposal. It is not a reason to withhold planning permission in the absence of any significant planning harm.

Conditions

13. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have imposed the standard time limit condition and, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the proposal be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. The Council has also suggested a condition requiring the external materials used in the development to match the existing building. This is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the SHCA.

Conclusion

14. The proposal would comply with the development plan taken as a whole. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

K Mansell

INSPECTOR