



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2025

by **D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3359589

23 Southern Road, Sale M33 6HP

- 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 Zhafarina Ungku against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref is 114683/HHA/24.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of an existing extension and the erection of a single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. For conciseness, the description of development from the council's decision notice has been adopted

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 25 Southern Road.

Reasons

4. The proposed development includes the erection of a single storey extension which would wrap around the rear 3-storey outrigger of a terraced property situated within a primarily residential area. As part of the proposed development an existing small addition located adjacent to the outrigger's rear elevation would be demolished.
5. The side elevation of the proposed extension would be erected adjacent to the shared boundary with 25 Southern Road. The existing boundary is a brick wall of around 1.4 metres in height and the eaves of the proposed extension's flank wall would be some 2.7 metres with a pitched roof sloping back towards the outrigger. The overall height of the appeal scheme would be around 3.6 metres. The flank wall of the proposed development would extend along the boundary for around 6 metres.
6. At ground floor level within the rear elevation of No. 25 is a window which serves a habitable room. Within the side elevation of this neighbouring property's outrigger are glazed openings which serve a large kitchen. There is a surfaced area between this outrigger and the shared boundary but the main part of the private amenity space is located to the rear rather than the side of the property.

7. By reason of siting, height and length, the proposed extension would be a visually intrusive and overbearing form of development for the occupiers of No. 25 when viewed from the side and rear windows of their property. There would be a tunnelling effect created between the proposed flank wall of the extension and the outrigger of No. 25 which would add to the sense of enclosure associated with the siting, height and length of the appeal scheme. Although not a reason for this appeal to fail, the siting, length and height of the appeal scheme would cause some reduction in the levels of daylight reaching the rear opening and side garden of No. 25 and this adds, in a modest way, to the unacceptable harm which has been identified. This assessment takes into account that the rear elevations of the property and No. 25 are south facing.
8. There would be an unacceptable adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 25 caused by the proposed extension. Further, there would be a conflict with Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy (TCS) concerning development not prejudicing the amenity of the occupants of adjacent properties by reason of overbearing, overshadowing and visual intrusion. There would also be a conflict with the guidance contained in the Council's *Supplementary Planning Document SPD4: Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations* whereby rear extensions should avoid overshadowing, physically dominating or overlooking neighbouring dwellings. This judgement has been reached in the knowledge that the current occupiers of No. 25 did not object to the appeal application but other people may well occupy the property at a later date.
9. Reference is made by the appellant to a fallback position associated with prior approval not being required for the erection of a 6 metre long extension sited in a similar location to the appeal scheme adjacent to the shared boundary with No. 25. (Ref 113668/PAH/24). This is an important material consideration, but the eaves height of the prior approval scheme would be circa 2 metres and the overall height would not exceed 3 metres. Accordingly, although the length would be the same, the height and bulk of the appeal scheme would be greater than the prior approval scheme and, as such, there would be a greater adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 25.
10. Claims by the appellant associated with the proposed extension being a better design than the prior approval scheme and the use of matching materials have been noted but they do not outweigh the unacceptable harm which has been identified. The detailed planning circumstances associated with alterations to other properties referenced by the appellant have not been provided and, for this reason, they have only been given limited weight in the determination of this appeal.
11. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 25 Southern Road and, as such, it would conflict with TCS Policy L7. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR