



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2025

by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3363982

13 Beech Road, Trafford, Hale WA15 9HX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Abram against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref is 115184/PAH/24.
 - The development proposed is described as 'single storey ground floor pitched roof rear extension and internal refurbishment works'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the appeal proposal constitutes development permitted under the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO).

Reasons

3. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse subject to limitations and conditions.
4. The Council's concerns in this case centre on whether the proposal meets the limitations in paragraph A.1(j), which states that development is not permitted if the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse, and would (i) exceed 4 metres in height, (ii) have more than a single storey, or (iii) have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse.
5. The appeal dwelling is a mid-terrace which has a part two-storey part single storey rear outrigger. The single storey part of the outrigger has a lean-to-roof. The proposed extension would infill the gap between the existing outrigger and the boundary with No 15 Beech Road. It would also change the roof of the single storey element of the outrigger to a pitched roof. Although the proposed extension would not be a full height wraparound extension, at the roof level it would be L-shaped.
6. The proposed extension would extend beyond the flank wall of the original rear outrigger which is a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse.

Moreover, where the roof form of the single storey element would be altered, the proposed extension would have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse. For these reasons, the proposed extension would fail to comply with A.1(j)(iii) of Class A of the GDPO.

7. I acknowledge the appellant's argument about the 'original rear wall', as outlined within the appeal decision¹ and the similarities between the appeal proposal and the approved drawings for a prior approval application². The appellant also asserts that the new roof would be an extension permitted under Class B of the GDPO. However, I have assessed the appeal proposal against the limitations and conditions set out within Class A of the GPDO. Therefore, the factors outlined by the appellant have not altered my assessment of the appeal proposal.
8. As the proposal would not comply with the condition set out under A.1(j)(iii), the proposed extension would not be granted planning permission by Class A of the GPDO.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

INSPECTOR

¹ Appeal ref: APP/B5480/D/21/3282956

² LPA ref: 82692/PAH/2014