



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2025

by **Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/24/3358442

6 Stamford Street, Sale, M33 6LL

- 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 Jason Monaghan against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref is 114598/HHA/24.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part single/part two-storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. These are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the both the existing property and the streetscene; and
 - The effect on the living conditions of the occupants of number 1B Stamford Street and numbers 10 and 11 Lawson Grove, with regard to outlook and privacy.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a relatively modest two-storey, semi-detached dwelling, which is situated in an area of high-density, close-knit properties. The dwelling has previously been extended at the rear, including a single-storey flat roofed kitchen.
4. The proposal is to construct further extensions at the rear and side of the dwelling, including a first floor above the existing kitchen and a single-storey side extension. These would provide a larger kitchen on the ground floor and an additional bedroom at first floor level. A first-floor window serving the bedroom would face the rear elevations and gardens of numbers 10 and 11 Lawson Grove (numbers 10 and 11). In addition, the rear walls of the extensions would be positioned close to the boundary and the rear garden of number 1B Stamford Street (number 1B).
5. The Council states that the proposal would be an unsympathetic and dominant form of development that would be out of character with both the existing property and the local area. It considers that the proposal would conflict with Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 2024. Amongst other things, the policy seeks to ensure that development proposals respect and

acknowledge the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale, and materials. Further guidance on these matters is contained in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations 2012.

6. Whilst the proposed extensions would add significantly to the dwelling, they would be positioned at the rear and side of the property, which are two elevations that are barely visible from the public domain. Although the side extension would project out from the existing side wall of the property, it would appear as a subordinate addition, well set-back from the front elevation. Furthermore, only a small part of the first-floor extension would be visible from the front elevation. Consequently, I am not persuaded that the proposal would be unacceptably harmful to either the appearance of the dwelling or the locality.

Living Conditions

7. The appeal site is tightly constrained by the limited space at the rear and side of the property and because of the close proximity of the neighbouring dwellings and gardens at numbers 10, 11 and 1B. The proposed single-storey kitchen extension would not have any adverse impacts on the neighbouring properties, because of its relatively low height and existing screen fencing. However, that cannot be said in respect of the first-floor addition.
8. With regard to the effect on number 1B, I consider that the additional mass and bulk at first-floor level would be unduly dominant and oppressive when viewed from the rear of the neighbouring property and its garden.
9. Turning to the impact on numbers 10 and 11, there would be an unacceptable degree of overlooking into the rear windows and gardens from the proposed first-floor window on the side elevation. I accept that there is an existing bedroom window on the side elevation, which already overlooks numbers 10 and 11. However, the appeal proposal would exacerbate that situation and increase the amount of overlooking that could take place.
10. For these reasons, I conclude on this issue that the proposal would conflict with Policy L7 of the adopted Trafford Local Plan Core Strategy 2012. This policy states, amongst other things, that development must not prejudice the amenity of occupants of adjacent properties.
11. In reaching my decision, I have given weight to the appellant's family requirements in terms of the need for additional space and the limited availability of affordable homes in the area. I have also noted that the appellant has suggested that a high-level window could be installed in the bedroom extension. However, whilst this could alleviate overlooking concerns, it would not resolve the overbearing impact on number 1B. Furthermore, I have noted the appellant's comments regarding the impacts that resulted from the construction of number 1B on the appeal property and its neighbour at number 4 Stamford Street. Whilst these are material considerations, they do not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above in relation to the effect on living conditions, the appeal is dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR