



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2025

by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3370812

23 Amberley Road, Trafford, Sale M33 6QP

- 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 Ian Thompson against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application ref is 116031/HHA/25.
 - The development proposed is described as the: erection of a part single/part two storey side extension, single storey front extension and a part single/part two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a part single/part two storey side extension, single storey front extension and a part single/part two storey rear extension at 23 Amberley Road, Trafford, Sale M33 6QP in accordance with the terms of the application, ref 116031/HHA/25, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1287-07; 1287-05; 1287-04; and 1287-03.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. During my site visit I was able to see everything from the appeal site and public land without entering the neighbour's land or property to judge the appeal proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 21 Amberley Road (No 21), with specific regard to outlook, and levels of daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

4. The appeal site shares a boundary with No 21. Both properties are set back from the boundary creating a modest gap between their side elevations. A high fence adjoins the shared boundary, close to the ground floor windows of each property. A bay window within the side elevation of No 21 faces the appeal property. The window serves a morning room and is the sole opening to this room. The

occupiers of No 21 describe this room as being used for dining and extensively during the day and evening. The proximity of the appeal property and particularly the high boundary fence to this window opening mean that the outlook, and levels of daylight and sunlight it provides the morning room is limited.

5. The proposal would project closer to the shared boundary with No 21, remaining set back with the proposed rear extension having a similar building line to the that of the rear of No 21. Given the close relationship of the boundary fence and appeal property to the morning room window, the modest projection of the proposal towards the shared boundary would have a limited effect on the existing outlook, and levels of sunlight and daylight of the morning room.
6. When referencing side extensions the Supplementary Planning Document SPD 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions & Alterations (2012) (the SPD) states that a gap of a minimum of one metre should be retained between the side elevation of an extended property and its side boundary. Whilst this is only guidance, it provides a guide as to the acceptable separation distance for side extensions. Given the proposal is set back approximately one metre from the boundary, it is compliant with this element of the SPD.
7. The presence of the boundary fence would limit views of the proposed rear projection from the morning room window. Further, the proposal would have a similar rear building line to that of the No 21 and would therefore preserve the existing outlook, and levels of daylight and sunlight of the ground floor rear openings of No 21.

Other Matters

8. I note the council refer to a planning refusal (110869/HHA/23) that they describe as being similar to this appeal, nonetheless this appeal follows the Council's formal decision, and I have reached a different conclusion to them.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have imposed a condition relating to materials to safeguard the character and appearance of the building and the area

Conclusion

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

N Unwin

INSPECTOR