



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2025 by A Khan BSc (Hons) MA MSc

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/24/3357666

127 Park Road, Timperley, Trafford WA15 6QQ

- 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 and Mrs A Brennan against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 113955/HHA/24.
 - The development proposed is raising the ridge height to create a first floor, rear extension, new pitched roof over converted garage and front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for raising the ridge height to create a first floor, rear extension, new pitched roof over converted garage and front porch extension at 127 Park Road, Timperley, Trafford WA15 6QQ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 113955/HHA/24 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Plans, Elevations and Site Plan 24-31-02 Rev. A.
 - 3) No development (above ground level) shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) The extensions hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the first floor windows to the side (west and east) elevations shown as such on the approved plans have been fitted with obscured glazing of no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington range of textured glass (or equivalent), and no part of those windows that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which they are installed shall be capable of being opened. The windows shall be retained as such thereafter.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development provided the application form has been amended in subsequent documents. I have adopted the description of development provided in the Council's Decision Notice as it accurately reflects the proposal before me.
4. The appellant submitted an amended plan as part of this appeal, to address the concerns raised in the Council's Case Officer report regarding discrepancies on the drawings. As this plan simply clarifies the ridge height of the property as a result of the proposal and does not alter the nature of the development previously consulted upon and determined by the Council, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the submitted drawings, together with this amended plan.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site lies in a residential area within a short row of bungalows, which have individual variations in style, form and materiality. The bungalows have relatively narrow gaps in between. The surrounding area, namely further along Park Road and on the opposite side of road to the appeal site, has dwellings of varied designs and heights which contribute to the lack of architectural uniformity. Dwellings in the area are typically set back from the road, often within spacious plots.
7. The area is also characterised by a progressive evolution in design with modern alterations and extensions of existing properties, and in the pattern of development, with the construction of new dwellings. The area includes properties with dormer additions, raised rooflines and new housing designs, resulting in a mix of traditional and modern architectural styles. This mix of dwellings contributes to the area's evolving suburban character.
8. It is clear that the size of the existing property would be increased considerably as a result of the proposed development, which includes a two storey rear extension and front porch extension. Although the scale, form, design and materials of the proposal would contrast with the character of the existing host property and neighbouring bungalows, it would nevertheless integrate well and align with the more modern development found within the wider surrounding area.
9. The footprint of the building would be extended, particularly to the rear, in line with the existing garage, but the resulting development would fit comfortably within its generous plot. Although the proposal would introduce additional bulk and massing to the rear of the property, there would be no more than glimpses of this extension within the street scene. The resulting development would be greater in height than its immediate neighbours, but it would, again, not appear out of place or unduly prominent within the evolving context of the area, which also includes two and a half storey dwellings.
10. The appeal scheme has sought to pick on design features and materials found in the surrounding area. The mix of traditional and contemporary architectural elements as part of the development would reflect the evolving character of the site's surroundings. The front gable design, while prominent, would introduce a

contemporary feature that would not be incompatible with the existing dwelling or surrounding area, as there are examples of similar features in proximity to the site. As the eaves and ridge heights of the property are proposed to be increased, the gable feature would overall retain a degree of subservience to the host building. The use of off-white render would not appear uncharacteristic, as it is a common feature in many of the dwellings of the surrounding area, including the site's immediate neighbouring property at no 125.

11. The proposed development therefore would align with the broader trend of modernisation within the site's surroundings and would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the proposal would accord with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document 2022 – 2039 (Adopted 21 March 2024), which states that development should respect the character and identity of the locality.
12. The proposal would also accord with the design aims of the Supplementary Planning Document SPD 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions & Alterations (Adopted February 2012) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which notably seek to ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development.

Other Matters

13. A Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment¹ (PBRA) carried out by Gritstone Ecology on 30 July 2024 was submitted as part of the planning application. The PBRA identifies the building as having negligible suitability for use by roosting bats, due to the building's good condition. Furthermore, no field signs of use by bats were found externally or internally. The PBRA therefore recommends no further survey work being required. The Council finds no issue with this recommendation, and I see no reason to disagree.

Conditions

14. Conditions have been imposed with regard to the timeframe for the commencement of development and compliance with the approved plans, in the interests of certainty and to provide clarity. A condition for details of external materials to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority is required to protect the character and appearance of the area. A condition requiring first floor windows to be obscure glazed and non-openable up to 1.7m is considered necessary to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

A Khan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

¹ Report No: 1354022, dated July 2024

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR