



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025 by Sara Manson DipTP

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3365040

Krishna Villa, 16 Bradgate Road, Altrincham, Cheshire WA14 4QU

- 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 Dr Himanshu Kataria against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 115059/HHA/24.
 - The development proposed is described as 'demolition of existing side and front extension and garage. Erection of two storey front and side, single storey front open garage and single storey front porch extensions including juliette balcony to side. Associated external alterations including replacing existing timber windows with new timber windows, new roof above bay window, landscaping and new boundary wall treatment'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure and Main Issues

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. The main issues in which are a) whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Devisdale Conservation Area; and b) the effect of the appeal scheme on the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 5 Hill Rise (No. 5) with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

The Devisdale Conservation Area (CA)

3. The appeal building is a large, detached, brick built dwelling, the only with a thatched roof in this sub zone of the CA. It is an attractive example of its type and largely intact. It has unique eyebrow style dormers set into the roof and a later tiled roof extension to the side which has modern flat roofed box style dormers. There are other extensions to the rear at ground floor level. Despite which, the dwelling exudes quality in its traditionality. What appears to be the original section remains the principal and dominant element in the plot. It is strongly legible as such amongst the later, clearly subservient, extensions.
4. The building is visible from the public highway where it sits with a street of other large scale, brick and sandstone detached dwellings and apartment buildings of varied architectural design, set back from a mature tree-lined private road. The majority of local boundary treatments comprise low stone walls with wooden fencing or rails above complimented with mature vegetation which supports the

quality of what is clearly a prevailing verdant feel. These and the above factors contribute positively to the significance of the CA.

5. The proposals would patently lack subservience to the host dwelling, due to their overall scale, form, and forward protrusion, resulting in overly prominent, modern features incompatible with their setting or the style of the building itself. The fenestration detailing along with the barn hipped gables would be unacceptably alien, exacerbated by the use of timber cladding that would introduce a material not evident in the property or surrounding area. These elements would combine to not only reduce the dominance of the original building but also unacceptably detract from its traditional qualities and unique detailing.
6. The proposed boundary treatments would not be proportionate to the existing arrangement, nor would they be of traditional design or materials. The solid gates would obscure the views to the property beyond and the removal of the conifer hedging coupled with the significant amount of hardstanding would erode the verdant qualities of the street scene.
7. Of the examples of other local boundary treatments cited, they appear to have a degree of permeability allowing views of the dwelling beyond and landscaping behind that reinforces the green and leafy characteristics of the CA. It is also unclear whether they were installed/built recently. They do not therefore sufficiently sway me from my earlier findings. The proposals are located off a private road, even so, limited public visibility does not obviate the need for high quality design or sufficiently reduce any harm found to the CA.
8. As a result of the above therefore, the proposals would harm the significance of the CA which would neither preserve nor enhance its character or appearance. This harm would be, owing to its localised effect, less than substantial for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Nevertheless, it is a matter of considerable weight and importance. In such circumstances, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
9. The appeal scheme would effectively replace some more modern extensions and continue the use and upkeep of a locally important building. That said, such would not justify the harm that would arise out of what would be put in their place, and it is unclear as to whether the appeal scheme would be the sole means of achieving either of these outcomes. Resultantly, I ascribe limited weight to these alleged public benefits or 'heritage gains'.
10. As such, the proposed development would conflict with Policy R1 of the Trafford Core Strategy (2012) (CS), Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (2024), guidance contained in SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations, Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD4), SPD5.10a: Devisdale Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document and the Framework. Together, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and are acceptable for the historic environment.

Living Conditions

11. The neighbours at No. 5 are set back at an angle from the appeal dwelling, with a southwestern facing garden. Although the proposed side extension would increase the built development along this boundary, it would not lead to an undue sense of

enclosure as the impact on outlook would be mitigated by the dwelling's orientation and distance from the boundary which consists of high evergreen mature hedging and trees. Given the height of the boundary and direction of sun, the proposals would have a negligible effect on the amount of light that would reach the garden of No.5. It would, therefore, not cause the rear garden or rear facing rooms to be noticeably darker or significantly alter the outlook for the occupiers of No. 5, which would be primarily over what is otherwise an open, unincumbered and generously sized rear garden.

12. As such, the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 5 would not be harmed by the proposed side extension. Consequently, and in regard to this main issue, the proposals would accord with Policy L7 of the CS and guidance contained in SPD4, which seek to ensure development does not adversely impact the amenity of neighbouring occupants amongst other things.

Other Matter

13. The appeal decision quoted is not sufficiently comparable to the scheme before me as it appears to be for a rear extension on a semi-detached property in another Conservation Area, the significance of which is unclear from the details in front of me. The proposed development has been considered on its own merits with regard to the specifics of its context and the significance of the CA in this case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. Whilst I have found for the appellant on the second main issue, this is as a result of a lack of harm which would be a neutral matter. There are no material considerations that would attract sufficient weight to indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan with which the appeal scheme would conflict owing to my findings on the first main issue. It is for this reason that I recommend the appeal is dismissed.

Sara Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR