



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

by **D Cleary MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3371128

4 Park Close, Timperley, Trafford WA14 5AG

- 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 Colin McHale against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 116470/HHA/25.
 - The development proposed is described as a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with predominantly brick elevations and a tiled hipped roof. The dwelling has a two-storey bow window to the front elevation, with gable roof above. The dwelling and its semi-detached pairing, No.2 Park Close (No.2), are similar in design and are visually well balanced.
4. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character with dwellings of a similar design and form. Park Close is a small cul-de-sac. The appeal property and No.2 are positioned at the head of the cul-de-sac and are oriented at an angle to the street. A public footpath runs immediately to the side of the appeal property. This links Park Close with Park Road to the rear of the site. Park Road is positioned at a higher land level and is accessed via a flight of steps on the footpath.
5. The two-storey side extension would be set back from the existing front elevation and would have a staggered front building line. The degree of projection to the side would be large, with the extension having a width which would be similar to that of the existing dwelling. However, the set-back from the front building line, along with reduced ridge heights, would ensure that the extension would appear subservient to the host dwelling. Therefore, there would be a clear visual hierarchy created, with the original dwelling remaining visually dominant in scale. Furthermore, the angled orientation of the dwelling would lessen the overall visual presence of the extension from Park Close.

6. Notwithstanding the above, the extension would include a chamfered elevation. This would result in the extension having splayed corner, rather than a square one. Consequently, the extension would also have an additional narrow hip within its roof form over the splayed corner. Therefore, the extension would introduce a form to its elevation and roof which is not of characteristic to the original dwelling and the extension would appear as a contrived addition. The orientation of the dwelling and position of the extension would mean that the form of the extension would not be prominent from Park Close. However, these parts of the extension would be positioned close to the adjacent footpath where the juxtaposition in design would be readily apparent. This visual incongruity would be exacerbated further when viewed from the elevated steps from Park Road, where a greater expanse of the extension could be viewed over the boundary fence. Therefore, the contrived form of the extension would appear at odds with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.
7. I note the examples of similar developments in the area which have been cited by the appellant. However, these are not identical to the appeal scheme which includes a form which is not characteristic to the host dwelling and positioned close to a public footpath. In any event, I have considered the appeal on its individual merits.
8. For the above reasons, the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area. The development therefore conflicts with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Document 2022 to 2039 (Adopted 21 March 2024). This, amongst other things, requires that development respects the identity of the locality in terms of design.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge that the development would not result in any adverse effects of the living conditions of nearby properties. This is not a matter in dispute between the parties and the absence of harm in this regard does not justify the development. Furthermore, I also note the proposal would provide additional space for the appellants family and this, in turn, would improve the existing housing stock. However, I am not persuaded that the appeal scheme is the only manner by which additional accommodation could be provided and such matters would not be sufficient to outweigh the permanent harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR