



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2025 by E Nutman BA (Hons)

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3364609

47 Foxhall Road, Timperley, Trafford WA15 6RW

- 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 Paul Cable against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 115509/HHA/25.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Two storey side and rear extension with a part single storey rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. At the time of my visit, development was commencing on site. However, I am aware of an extant permission in place for a similar scheme. Nonetheless, I have determined the appeal based on the submitted details.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Foxhall Road is primarily characterised by two-storey, semi-detached dwellings. There is variation in the design of dwellings on the wider street, including in instances where dwellings have been extended. Even so, No. 47 and its counterpart at 45 Foxhall Road (No 45) form part of a cluster of semi-detached pairs sharing a similar form and aesthetic, including prominent shared central gables, similarly proportioned wings projecting to the side of the gable, ground floor bay windows, projecting porches and rendered finishes to their front elevations. Consequently, these pairs have an overriding symmetry which positively contributes to the appearance of the street and the character of the locality.
6. The width of the side extension would measure less than half the width of the host dwelling and would retain a suitable gap to the side boundary. In these respects, it would meet some of the guidance for side extensions set out within The Trafford

Council Supplementary Planning Document SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions & Alterations (2012) (SPD4).

7. However, the continuation of the main roof plane and ridge level, combined with the extension's very minimal first floor setback means that the original form of the dwelling would not be easily distinguishable from the extension. As a result, the extended wing would have an elongated appearance. This would also markedly unbalance the host in relation to its counterpart at No 45, particularly in the context of the overriding symmetry of the semi-detached pairs of the same aesthetic on the street. Therefore, the extension would appear unacceptably prominent, significantly detracting from the character of the dwelling. In those respects, it would be contrary to specific aspects of the guidance for side extensions at paragraph 3.1.1 of SPD4.
8. The appellant contends that a similarly scaled extension has been granted planning permission on the site (LPA Ref 114016/HHA/24). However, the evidence suggests that particular extension incorporates a lowered ridge line and a more pronounced set back to the first floor front elevation and therefore is not directly comparable. Whilst SPD4 sets out that "a setback of as little as half a brick length will allow for a neat join", a neat join of brickwork does not overcome my broader concerns in respect of the scale and design of the extension, particularly in light of the site-specific context in this instance.
9. There are two-storey side extensions to other semi-detached dwellings in the area. However, some of the examples provided by the appellant relate to semi-detached pairs of a different design or dwellings on other streets. Some of the examples also pre-date the adoption of SPD4. Where similar extensions have taken place to dwellings of a similar design to the appeal dwelling, these are few in number and set away from the more immediate surrounds of the appeal site. They do not indicate that the proposed extension's unsympathetic design would be justified, particularly when considering the appearance of the appeal dwelling, its respective pair and the prevailing character of similarly styled dwellings on the street.
10. I am aware of a previous, albeit larger, proposal which was dismissed under appeal reference APP/Q4245/D/23/3326384. The appellant contends that the Inspector in that case implied that either a set down in ridge height or set back from the front elevation was required, not both. In any case, for the reasons set out, the very minimal setback proposed is not sufficient to ensure the extension complements the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the distinctive semi-detached pair it forms part of.
11. I conclude, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it conflicts with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024) which requires that development respects and acknowledges the character of the locality in terms of design, siting, size and scale. For the same reasons it would also conflict with the requirements at paragraphs 131 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework for good design and for developments to be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

12. Even though there is no dispute that the proposal would retain acceptable living conditions for neighbouring occupiers and occupiers of the host dwelling, this does not overcome the harm identified under the main issue.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Nutman

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR