



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2025

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/25/3366189

2 Sherwood Avenue, Droylsden, Manchester, M43 7JJ

- 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 and Mrs Tom and Claire Anderson against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00162/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension and double and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension and double and single storey rear extension at 2 Sherwood Avenue, Droylsden, Manchester, M43 7JJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00162/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 scale Location Plan; Drawing Numbers: KH988-001 and KH988-101.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the streetscene; and the effect on the outlook from the neighbouring dwelling at number 4 Sherwood Avenue (number 4).

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is an end-of-terrace two storey dwelling, which is situated in a prominent corner position in a residential estate. The dwelling has previously been enlarged by the construction of a single storey side extension. The built character of the area is defined by blocks of terraced properties, some of which have been altered and extended, including the dwelling opposite the appeal site at number 1 Sherwood Avenue.

4. The proposal would substantially enlarge the appeal property by constructing a first-floor extension above the existing single storey side addition with a two storey and single storey extension at the rear. The extension would have a hipped roof, which would be slightly lower than the highest part of the roof on the original dwelling.
5. The Council considers that the proposal would be out of character and at odds with other properties in the area. It argues that it would dominate the streetscene and would harm the visual amenity of the area. The Council cites a conflict with Policies C1 and H10 of the adopted Tameside Unitary Development Plan 2004 (UDP) and with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document 2024 (JDP).
6. Although Policy H10 of the UDP refers specifically to new housing developments, the Council generally seeks (amongst other things) to ensure that development respects local character and that design is of a high quality. Further guidance is contained in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Design (SPD). The SPD advises (amongst other things) that rear extensions should not dominate the existing dwelling; that side extensions should be set-back by 0.5m – 1m and the extended dwelling must align with its surroundings in terms of mass and scale.
7. The Council's policies and guidance accord with the provisions of paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024, which also requires development to be visually attractive and be sympathetic to local character.
8. I accept that the proposed extensions would be a dominant addition to the property, and they would be clearly seen when viewed from both Sherwood Avenue and Jack Lane (at the side). However, whilst there is some conflict with the Council's guidance, I am not persuaded that the proposal would be unacceptable.
9. As stated above, the character and appearance of the area is defined by linear blocks of buildings, some with rear additions. The proposed side extension would continue this linear form and character and the space between the side wall of the extension and the side boundary along Jack Lane would ensure that the extension overall would not have an overbearing impact on the streetscene. Furthermore, the hipped roof and the proposed use of matching external materials would complement the existing building.

Outlook

10. The Council states that the proposed rear extension would have an overbearing impact on the rear of number 4 resulting in a loss of outlook and natural light. It refers to a conflict with Policy H10 of the UDP. Whilst this policy relates to proposed housing developments, I consider it good practice to ensure that proposals of any form do not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.
11. I observed at my site visit that number 6 Sherwood Drive has a two storey rear extension and that the appeal proposal would partially enclose number 4 on its opposite side. However, the closest part of the extension to number 4 would be single storey. The appellant also points to the proposed extension not projecting in front of a line drawn at 45 degrees from the neighbouring window.

12. I consider this issue to be closely balanced, but my conclusion is that the proposal would not have an unacceptably harmful effect on the amenity of the occupants of number 4.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. In addition to the standard conditions relating to the time period in which to commence the development and the listing of the approved plans, a further condition requiring the use of matching external materials is also imposed. This is necessary to ensure a satisfactory external appearance.

Conclusion

14. For the reason given above, it is concluded that the appeal be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR