



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: 24 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3366686

44 Auburn Road, Trafford, Old Trafford M16 9NT

- 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 Saeed against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref is 115517/HHA/25.
 - The development proposed is double storey side extension with infill rear single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - The effect of the two-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 - The effect of the single storey rear extension on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at 42 Auburn Road with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Auburn Road mainly comprises semi-detached dwellings. Whilst there is some variation to the style and proportion of the houses, the street maintains a sense of uniformity. This is achieved through the broadly consistent building line, the predominant use of red brick and render as facing materials and recurring architectural features such as tiled curved front bay windows. Many of the properties have side driveways, creating gaps between the pairs of semi-detached houses that contributes to the street's cohesive and spacious character.
4. The appeal property at 44 Auburn Road is a semi-detached dwelling of a similar form and appearance to the attached property at No 42, as well as those immediately neighbouring it. A hard surfaced driveway to the side of the house provides access to a garage. The appeal scheme would demolish this outbuilding and introduce a part single, part-two-storey side extension on the driveway that also projects to the rear, along with a single storey rear extension.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations' (2012) (SPD4 GDHEA) advises that a minimum 1m gap should be maintained between a two-storey side extension and the

boundary to preserve the impression of space to the side of a dwelling. In this case, whilst the proposed side extension would be set back from the front elevation and be lower in height than the host dwelling, it would be built up to the boundary with 46 Auburn Road. Even if this would not create physical terracing, insofar as there are presently no two-storey side extensions to No 46, the size, position and massing of the appeal proposal would result in a loss of openness to the boundary. It would undermine the reasonably regular pattern of gaps between dwellings that are characteristic of the street and result in a cramped appearance. This would be to the detriment of the wider street scene.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to other extensions along Auburn Road. I do not find the roof alterations, including to No. 40, to be comparable to the proposal before me. Whilst a two-storey side extension is evident at No 20, I have no details of its planning permission, nor its history. Consequently, I cannot be certain as to the detailed considerations that applied in that case. Moreover, although several houses along the street have side extensions, including those at Nos 10, 16, 22, 34, 36, 38, 40 and 48, these are single storey. The lack of built form above them maintains the sense of spaciousness between the houses that contributes to the arrangement of the semi-detached pairs along the road. The appeal scheme would noticeably reduce the gap between Nos 44 and 46 and the spacing between them. This would be to the detriment of the visual and spatial quality of the street scene.
7. I therefore find that the two-storey side extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it conflicts 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 in design and scale. It would further conflict with guidance in SPD4 GDHEA (2012) in relation to two-storey side extensions, and with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Living Conditions

8. The proposed single-storey rear extension would project approximately 6 metres from the rear elevation of the appeal property. It would have a part-flat, part mono-pitch roof that would sit just below a rear first-floor window at its highest point. From my observations on site, this would exceed the height of the existing vegetation on the boundary shared by No 44 and the adjoining neighbouring property at No 42. Furthermore, even though 42 Auburn Road benefits from a reasonably generous garden, the scale and depth of the proposed rear extension, combined with its siting adjacent to the shared boundary, would result in an oppressive form of development from the part of No 42's amenity area that is closest to their house, which is likely to be the most well used. It would also be dominant and overbearing when seen from the nearest ground floor room at the back of No 42. It would consequently result in a loss of outlook for these neighbouring occupants.
9. I am also mindful that in relation to the sun's path, the appeal proposal would sit to the south of No 42. Guidance in SPD4 GDHEA states that to prevent developments from being physically dominant, single-storey rear extensions to semi-detached properties positioned near a boundary should not project more than 3 metres. In the absence of any detailed assessment such as a shadow study, based on the evidence before me, the combination of the rear extension's position along the boundary, its scale and projection would result in some overshadowing of No 42's rear ground floor window, as well as an undue sense of enclosure.

10. The appellant has drawn my attention to a potential fall-back through the prior approval process in relation to the single storey rear extension, having regard to Class A, Part 1 of Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO). However, even if no representations to the appeal scheme were received in the period it was being considered by the local planning authority, I am mindful that neighbours and their views may change. As such, I cannot assume that objections would not be received, and that prior approval would be granted. Furthermore, I have not been advised of any prior approval consent or certificate of lawfulness issued in relation to the development.
11. Moreover, whether or not a similar proposal could be constructed under permitted development rights is not a matter to be determined in the context of a Section 78 appeal. In this case, the single storey rear extension would form an integral part of the wider appeal proposal. It would extend across the entire width of the garden, beyond the side elevation of the original dwelling. I have not been provided with sufficient evidence to clearly demonstrate that a similar development would comply with the GPDO's requirements for both side and rear extensions. As such, a full and detailed comparison with the appeal proposal cannot be made. I am therefore not persuaded that there is a greater than theoretical possibility that permitted development rights would be exercised for a similar proposal, or that the fallback would be pursued if the appeal is dismissed. I attach limited weight to it as a result.
12. For these reasons, I conclude that the single storey rear extension would lead to unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at 42 Auburn Road with regard to outlook. It would therefore conflict with Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012), which seeks to ensure, amongst other matters, that development must not prejudice the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties. It would further conflict with guidance in SPD4 GDHEA (2012) in relation to single storey rear extensions and fail to accord with the Framework in terms of securing high amenity standards for current and future occupiers.

Other Matters

13. I appreciate that the appeal scheme would provide additional living space for a multi-generational family and meet both their immediate and long-term needs. However, such personal circumstances do not, in my view, outweigh the harms that I have previously noted. Furthermore, even if it represented an efficient use of the site, given that the proposal is for an extension to a residential property, any benefit in this respect would be limited and it would not weigh significantly in favour of the proposed development. As such, neither this, nor any of the other matters above, would overcome or outweigh the harms that I have identified.

Conclusion

14. The appeal proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations that would indicate a decision otherwise would be appropriate. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K. Mansell

INSPECTOR