



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 April 2025

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4230/D/24/3357237

5 St Edmunds Row, Bridgewater Street, Little Hulton, Worsley, Salford, M38 9ND

- 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 LE Properties NW Ltd against the decision of Salford City Council.
 - The application Ref is PA/2024/1167.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 3 Bridgewater Street, with regards to outlook and sunlight/daylight.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey, brick-built mid terrace dwelling. It is set back from the road behind a parking area and has a garden to the rear.
4. The appeal property is located in a predominantly residential area characterised by the presence of largely two-storey terraced dwellings. There is a large two storey care home to the rear of the appeal property, with green space separating the care home building from the appeal dwelling's rear garden.
5. Whilst relatively small, this green space provides for a pleasant backdrop immediately to the rear of the small back gardens of properties along this side of Bridgewater Street. Whilst Bridgewater Street itself appears largely built-up and densely developed, the area to the rear provides for a more green and spacious character.
6. The proposed development would project to the rear of the appeal dwelling adjacent to the shared boundary with the adjoining property, Number 3 Bridgewater Street. During my site visit, I observed No 3 to comprise a small single storey dwelling. I also observed that No 3's small rear garden has a patio and sitting area immediately adjacent to its rear elevation.
7. The proposed rear extension would reach two stories in height. I find that the combination of its extremely close proximity, projection and height would result in the proposal looming above the rear of No 3 to an overbearing degree. The

proposal would unduly dominate the outlook from the rear of No 3, most notably from a rear-facing window close to the shared rear boundary.

8. Further to the above, I find that the proposal would also loom above and dominate the outlook from that part of No 3's rear garden immediately adjacent to its rear elevation to the extent that it would appear oppressive. This would be to the detriment of the outlook of occupiers when using their patio area.
9. I am mindful that No 3 is located to the south of the appeal property and hence, that it would still receive adequate amounts of sunlight throughout the year. However, the height, projection and very close proximity of the proposal would result in reduced amounts of daylight reaching the rear of No 3, especially during the winter months. I consider that this would add to the oppressiveness of the proposal.
10. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 3 Bridgewater Street, with regards to outlook and sunlight/daylight, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Policy D5 of the Salford Local Plan: Development Management Policies and Designations (2023); and to the Council's House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2006), which together amongst other things, seek to protect residential amenity.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR