



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2025 by Sara Manson DipTP

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3368708

4 Park Square, Manchester, Lancashire M16 0GG

- 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 Karl Townsend against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 115605/HHA/25.
 - The development proposed is described as 'erection of first floor side and rear extension with associated external alterations including rooflights and rear balcony'.
-

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 and Main Issue

3. I have taken the description of development from the decision notice. It reflects the works in more precise and concise terms. It does not change anything fundamental in regard to the specifics of the appeal scheme and thus does not prejudice the abilities of the main parties to make their respective cases in regard thereto. The main issue in which is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is one of a pair of semi-detached two-storey dwellings situated in a small cul-de-sac. They are simply and traditionally designed, featuring a two storey curved and gabled bay window to the front with a hipped roof to the main section. The immediate area comprises similar designed properties. By virtue of limited visible alterations, defined spacing between and a setback from the highway with modest front gardens and driveways, there is a pleasant consistency and originality to the street which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The first-floor extension above the flat-roofed garage, although set back from the principal elevation, would introduce a fragmented mix of materials and modern features incompatible with their setting or style of the building itself. The long vertical fenestration and varied rooflines, transitioning abruptly from a flat front section to a steep gable pitch, would be unacceptably alien, exacerbated by the

use of red and grey metal cladding that would introduce a material not evident in the property or surrounding area. These incongruous elements would combine to unacceptably reduce the quality of the area's consistent and original feel. The gable pitched element, although predominantly to the rear, would be partially visible from public viewpoints, and would further subsume the original building's form, appearing awkward and poorly integrated.

6. Additionally, the proposals would extend closer to the boundary with Number 6 Park Square, resulting in a narrowing of the existing gap and thus appearing cramped, reducing the pleasant spaciousness.
7. While cited examples involve extensions and new buildings with a modern appearance, the full planning history of each is not available to me, and I cannot be certain of the material considerations that informed those developments. However, they differ significantly from the current proposal and would not be viewed in the same context. As such, they do not address my specific concerns regarding the visual impact of the proposed development on the host dwelling and surrounding area. In addition, the use of sustainable materials and other energy saving methods of construction would be positive, but I am unclear as to whether such options are reliant solely on the appeal scheme and they could not be achieved by other less harmful means. I would not therefore be led to allowing the appeal in their light.
8. Consequently, the appeal proposals would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, they would conflict with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, 2022 to 2039 (2024) and guidance contained in the Supplementary Planning Document 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions & Alterations, (2012) as the proposed extensions would fail to achieve a high-quality design, reflect positively to their context, or respect and complement the form, and detailing of the host dwelling and street scene. In addition, the appeal proposals would conflict with paragraphs 131 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework due to their detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding built development.

Other Matters

9. Whilst the apparent lack of engagement from the Council has caused frustration, these matters are between the main parties and do not affect my consideration of the main issue. Any concerns relating to conduct are best addressed through direct engagement with the Council, utilising any complaints procedure that it may have. Furthermore, any lack of harm arising out of the works on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers or highway safety through parking or disturbance would be neutral and not weigh in favour of the appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal proposals would conflict with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sara Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR