



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/U4230/D/25/3365684

Alcedonia, 10 Stafford Road, Monton, M30 9HW

- 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 Wayne King against the decision of Salford City Council.
 - The application Ref is PA/2024/1349.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey garage/outbuilding to front of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. These are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and the effect of the proposal on existing trees.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal proposal is to construct a single storey detached garage/outbuilding in front of the existing dwelling. It would be built close to the shared side boundary with the neighbouring dwelling at number 12 Stafford Road (number 12). The external bricks and tiles would match those used on the existing house. The garage/outbuilding would be 3.14m wide and 5.01m long at its widest and longest points.
4. Stafford Road is characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings with relatively long and spacious front gardens. Trees and other vegetation give the streetscene and gardens a verdant appearance, which contribute positively to the amenity of the area. With a few exceptions (some of which have been drawn to my attention by the appellant), the front gardens are generally devoid of buildings and there is a consistent and regular building line defined by the fronts of the properties.
5. The site is not in a conservation area, but it is within an area defined by the Council as Ellesmere Park Sub-Area 2, which is part of Ellesmere Park, an area in which the Council seeks to protect its heritage and character. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Ellesmere Park 2006 states that the Sub-Area 2 features a mix of properties with long wide roads, verges, boundary walls and an abundance of large garden trees and shrubs.

6. Whilst front gardens are not specifically mentioned in the SPD, the document does state that the loss of garden areas to development and car parking, which detracts from the area's green and spacious appearance is a key issue. In that regard, Policy 5 of the SPD states that development should retain the spacious character of the area, including the strong building line set well behind a boundary wall and front garden area.
7. Although the proposed garage/outbuilding would be relatively modest in size and it would be partially obscured from view behind the front boundary wall and gates, I consider that it would appear as a disruptive feature, and it would be at odds with the prevailing and predominant character and appearance of the area.
8. Policies D1, D2 of the Salford Local Plan (which I consider to be the most relevant) require the design of new development to be of high quality and respond to and have regard to local character and distinctiveness. These are consistent with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (NPPF), which also states that development should be sympathetic to local character and history. For the reasons given above, I consider that the proposal conflicts with the relevant policies and guidance.
9. In reaching my decision, I have considered the existence of other structures/buildings in front of dwellings in the locality. I was unable to view all the examples referred to by the appellant, but I did view the outbuildings/garages at number 38 Stafford Road, 8 and 10 Cavendish Road and at number 49 Ellesmere Road. The garages at number 8 and 10 Cavendish Road appear to part of a modern development and part of the original layout. The structures at 38 Stafford Road and 49 Ellesmere Road appear to be older and they do not sit directly in front of the dwelling. Consequently, they appear more discreet in the streetscene. Accordingly, in my opinion, they do not set a precedent for this appeal. Furthermore, I am required to determine this appeal on its own merits irrespective of other cases.

Trees

10. The Council states that the trees at the front of the appeal property and at the front of number 12 are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. It is not clear to me, from the information provided, as to whether other trees along the shared side boundary with number 12 have the same degree of protection. Notwithstanding, there are trees along the boundary, some of which would be close to the proposed garage/outbuilding.
11. The Council points to the absence of a tree survey and report and, therefore, it is unable to assess the impact of the proposal on the existing trees. Whilst the appellant states that a survey was not requested and the issue could have been resolved, I agree with the Council's position on this issue, particularly as tree coverage is a significant and distinctive characteristic of the area.
12. Policy G15 of the Council's Local Plan requires developments to be designed and constructed in such a way as to minimise any adverse impacts on trees. I have no evidence to conclude that the proposal would meet this requirement.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR