



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3373916

15 Medway Crescent, Altrincham WA14 4UA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land carried out without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs V Chetty against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 116743/VAR/25, dated 14 July 2025, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2025.
 - The application sought planning permission for demolition of existing conservatory, conversion of existing attached garage to habitable living accommodation, erection of first floor side extension and part single/part two storey rear extension, Juliette balconies to rear and associated external alterations including new windows and solar panels without complying with conditions attached to planning permission Ref 114735/HHA/24, dated 2 December 2024.
 - The conditions in dispute are Nos 2 and 3 which state that:
 - (2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers: 01 Rev. G, 02 Rev. A (received by the Local Planning Authority on 17th October 2024) and 03 Rev. D (received by the Local Planning Authority on 18th November 2024).
 - (3) Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no works involving the use of any materials to be used externally on the building shall take place until samples and / or full specifications of all such materials (including buff brick, dark brown roof tiles, white uPVC windows and mock Tudor panelling) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - The reasons given for the conditions are:
 - (2) To clarify the permission, having regard to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone, and the National Planning Policy Framework.
 - (3) In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity having regard to Policy JP-P1 of PfE and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. Planning permission for the development was granted subject to conditions including Condition 2 specifying the plans which formed the basis of the permission, and Condition 3 requiring the submission of samples or specifications of materials prior to the commencement of development.
3. The development has commenced and the Council has set out that these conditions have not been complied with, and it has refused to vary the conditions due to concerns regarding the character of the locality and the existing dwelling.

The appellants seek to vary the conditions to amend the approved plans and alter the wording of the materials condition to reflect the as built development.

4. On that basis, the main issue is whether the conditions are reasonable and necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. With regard to Condition 2, the appellants seek to replace the approved Drawing No. 01 Rev G with 01 Rev H. The works carried out have been varied compared to the plans approved under this condition. As set out by the appellants, this includes the removal of brick and cill courses from the front elevation as well as changes to fenestration. The Council's concerns on this issue relate to the omission of brick headers and cills on the front elevation, which are features of windows on the front elevations of nearby properties. The inclusion of these features would tie the extended dwelling into the wider streetscape, and on that basis I consider that requiring their retention as proposed on Drawing No. 01 Rev G means that Condition 2 is reasonable and necessary in the interests of character and appearance.
6. However, the appellants have confirmed that the development has been altered to insert headers and cills in respect of the front gable windows. Therefore, even if I was to vary Condition 2 to refer to Drawing No 01 Rev H, it would not represent the development as built.
7. Turning to Condition 3 and the use of materials, the development has been constructed using the Ibstock Ivanhoe Westminster brick type. Although the Council considers that the image within the appellants' Materials Specification does not accurately reflect the brick used, it accepts that the stated brick type is consistent with that installed on the property. As described by the Council, this brick type consists of three different colours described as buff, black/dark brown and red. The Council sets out that there are clusters of individual brick colours with varying amounts on different parts of the building, and this reflects my observations on my visit.
8. The appeal site is located on a relatively modern estate of an attractive suburban character. There is some variation in the use of materials within the streetscape, including mock-tudor cladding and varying brick types. The bricks include buff coloured bricks and those of redder colour, although each brick type is used in a uniform manner on each dwelling. This gives each dwelling a consistent material palette, and even allowing for the variation of brick colours between dwellings the materials in the streetscape are of an understated and relatively consistent appearance.
9. Within this context, the variation of colours and the arrangement of the brickwork as used on the appeal site introduces an incongruous and jarring feature into the streetscape. The Council also refers to the marked contrast with the original buff brick of the dwelling, and although the appellants refer to the painting of some bricks on a visible elevation this is not sufficient to mitigate for the incongruous appearance of this brick type in the wider streetscape.
10. The development also uses anthracite grey window frames, anthracite grey facias/soffits and flat grey concrete roof tiles. These features do not complement

other dwellings in the streetscape which have white window frames and brown pantiles. Although nearby properties could change the colour of their window frames and roofs without needing planning permission, I did not observe any cases where this had been done to the same extent as the appeal proposal, and it has not been demonstrated that there is a significant likelihood that this will occur. Potential alterations to nearby properties do not negate my conclusion on the harm arising from the appeal proposal within its current context.

11. Taken together, these factors unacceptably exacerbate the impact of what is a significant extension to the host dwelling. Whilst the materials used may be of a high quality, this does not mitigate for their incongruous appearance within the context of the prevailing streetscape.
12. The appellants refer to a property opposite which uses a multi-brick rather than a plain buff or red colour. However, although there are some darker patches on the individual bricks, this is more muted than the range of colour of bricks used in the appeal proposal and does not set a context for the variation in colour and arrangement of the proposal's brickwork. Furthermore, the property opposite reflects the materials used in nearby dwellings and does not appear as an incongruous feature within the streetscape.
13. Reference is also made to 3 recently constructed properties on Oldfield Road which use a similar multi-brick to the appeal development as well as grey window frames and tiles. However, these are in a distinctly separate location on a self-contained site in a streetscape with much greater variation in designs and materials compared to the appeal proposal. Due to the nature of the Oldfield Road site and its context, the use of multi-brick and other materials is an acceptable approach in that instance and does not indicate inconsistency on behalf of the Council.
14. I am mindful that no objections were received to the proposed use of materials and that several nearby residents have written in support of the proposal. However, these considerations do not lead me to a different conclusion in respect of the identified harm based on what I have seen and read.
15. I conclude that the amendments proposed would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and that some of the proposed amendments do not reflect the development as built. Therefore, the disputed conditions are reasonable and necessary in the interests of clarity and the satisfactory appearance of the development in the interests of visual amenity. The appeal proposal would therefore conflict with the design and materials requirements of Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 2024, and the National Planning Policy Framework with regard to achieving well-designed places. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice of the Supplementary Planning Document SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations 2012 with regards to reflecting the existing character of the property and respecting the street scene.
16. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR