



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2025

by **K Mansell BA (Hons) MPhil TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3366494

178 Stamford Street, Trafford, Old Trafford M16 9LU

- 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 Dan Rostron against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref is 115133/HHA/24.
 - The development proposed is described as 'roof extension to 178 Stamford Street. Revised Retrospective application'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. During my site visit, I observed a rear roof dormer at the appeal property, the subject of a previously refused planning application¹. The appeal proposal would modify this existing dormer. However, for the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal based solely on the plans submitted with it.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Stamford Street comprises a uniform terrace of Victorian/Edwardian era red brick dwellings that follow a very consistent building line to the front and are of a reasonably similar architectural style. A distinctive feature of these houses is the repeating pattern of two-storey, gable-ended outriggers with uninterrupted roof planes extending from the rear of each property. These projections contribute to the regular rhythm and cohesive appearance of the terraces, reinforcing an overall sense of architectural harmony to the pattern of development in the area.
5. The appeal property at 178 Stamford Street is a mid-terraced house. The appeal scheme would introduce a flat roofed dormer to one of the pitched roof slopes of the rear outrigger. Even though it would be set in from the rear elevation of the outrigger, and it would sit below the height of the dwelling's main roof, the dormer would nonetheless occupy a significant proportion of the roof slope. It would also noticeably project above the ridge of the outrigger's roof. The box like structure

¹ LPA Reference: 114097/HHA/24

would therefore add significant bulk and massing to the property, failing to respect the dwelling's original proportions. Consequently, the dormer would represent a visually obtrusive addition to the host property and the use of matching materials would not overcome this harm.

6. The appeal property sits close to the junction of Stamford Street and Norton Street, with its rear elevation visible from this latter side road. On my site visit, I also saw that the roof slope onto which the dormer would be sited could be seen from Crofton Street. The proposed dormer would be clearly seen from these public viewpoints. I observed no other rear dormers to outriggers to neighbouring properties, nor to any within the immediate vicinity. Rather than being perceived against the rear roofscape, the appeal scheme would disrupt both the outrigger roof profile of the appeal property and the consistent roof form of the buildings that adjoin it. It would therefore detract from the simple repeating vernacular of these traditional properties, and it would be an alien and incongruous feature as a result.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of other rear dormers within the vicinity of the appeal property. The dormer to the rear of 4 Crofton Street is sited on the main roof rather than a rear outrigger roof slope, and I do not find it comparable as a result. Moreover, in relation to this addition and the roof dormer at 3 Premier Street, I have not been provided with full details of these planning permissions nor their history. Consequently, I cannot be certain as to the detailed considerations that applied in those cases. In any event, I am required to reach conclusions based on the individual circumstances and merits of the appeal before me.
8. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such, it would conflict with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document 2022-2039 (2024), which seeks, amongst other matters, to ensure that development respects the character and identity of the locality. It would further conflict with guidance in the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document, SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (2012), including advice that a dormer window should complement the parent roof and be small scale and modest in size. It would also fail to accord with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

9. Whilst the proposal would provide additional living space for the appellant, personal circumstances seldom outweigh more general planning considerations, particularly where development would be permanent. Nor does the absence of neighbour objections, nor any identified highway, parking or ecology impacts, justify development that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations that warrant taking a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

K. Mansell

INSPECTOR