



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3366812

8 Ravenswood Road, Stretford, Manchester M32 0RT

- 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 M Sohail against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 115604/HHA/25.
 - The development is a proposed two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure, Preliminary Matter and Main Issues

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. The above description is from the application form, but I understand the scheme includes part single storey and rear elements which I have taken into account. The main issues in regard to which is their effect on a) the character and appearance of the area; and b) the living conditions of the occupants of Numbers 15 and 16 Adlington Drive with specific regard to privacy.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi detached dwelling in render with a gable roof. The surrounding area comprises mainly other semi-detached pairs of two-storey dwellings similar and thus consistent in design and appearance with gable roofs, bay windows and rendered exteriors. Some have extensions to the side. The above factors give the area a local distinctiveness which creates a sense of uniformity and cohesion which contributes positively to its character and appearance.
4. The proposed two storey side and rear extension would be flush with the existing ridge height as well as the front elevation. They would significantly enlarge the footprint of the dwelling and thus not appear to be visually subordinate. This would be further exacerbated by the addition of the second two storey bay window which would erode the symmetry between the appeal dwelling and its attached neighbour resulting in a bulky imbalance. As a result, and despite using an appropriate external finish, the proposals would unacceptably erode the uniform quality of the area.

5. There are other side extensions in the vicinity. Notably the two storey side addition to the property opposite. However, that extension is clearly read as subordinate by virtue of its modest width which maintains the space between the dwelling and the highway which in turn allows the original dwelling to be clearly legible. It is not sufficiently similar to the scheme before me to change my findings.
6. For the reasons as set out, the proposed extensions would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such it would fail to comply with the Policy JP – P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (2024) which requires development to respect and acknowledge the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used amongst other things. The proposal would also be contrary to the guidance set out in SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (2012) which requires development to be appropriately scaled, designed and sited.

Living Conditions

7. The distance between the proposed rear bedroom window in the two storey extension and the boundary between the appeal site and Nos 15 and 16 Adlington Drive would be less than the separation distance between habitable room windows and common boundaries set out by SPD4. Be this as it may, thick vegetation separates the appeal site and properties on Adlington Drive and whilst this would not be verdant throughout the year, it would provide an acceptable level of screening due to its density and size, such that it would safeguard the privacy of the garden users at Numbers 15 and 16 Adlington Drive. The appeal scheme would therefore not conflict with Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy (2012) which requires development to not prejudice the amenity of neighbouring occupiers amongst other things.

Other Matters

8. I note the appellants desire to create a modern family home, but this would be a private benefit for the incumbent occupiers and thus worthy of only very limited weight. Any areas where the appeal scheme is acceptable would be a lack of harm rather than a benefit and thus neutral as a consideration. No alternative schemes demonstrating how revisions could be made to make the proposals acceptable have been presented. In any case, the appeal process should not be used as a means to evolve a scheme and what is before me should be what the Council issued a determination on. Any changes should be addressed with a fresh application to the Council in the first instance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. Whilst I have found in the appellant's favour in regard to the second main issue, this would also be a neutral matter. The harm and subsequent development plan conflict I have found in regard to the first would remain. Material considerations do not attract sufficient weight to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decisions

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR