



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3370801

8 Ely Avenue, Stretford, Trafford M32 9TT

- 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 Sadiq Adebambo against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref is 116127/HHA/25.
- The development proposed is part ground floor and first-floor side extension with a change of roof from hip-end to gable-end.

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 Matters

3. The Planning Appeals: Procedural Guide (PG) sets out that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme. It is important that what is considered by the Inspector at appeal is essentially the same scheme that was considered by the Council and by interested parties at the application stage. The PG goes on to state that in deciding whether to, exceptionally, accept the proposed amendment, as per the judgement in Holborn¹, which refined the Wheatcroft principles², consideration must be given to the substantive and procedural tests.
4. On substantive grounds, the amended plans submitted with the appeal alter the design of the proposed development to include a hipped roof and for the first-floor side extension to be set in from the boundary and setback from the front elevation. The amended plan is significantly different to the plans on which the Council made its decision. Moreover, this would be procedurally unfair on the Council which has not had the opportunity to comment on the amended plans. I have therefore assessed the proposal on the basis of the originally refused drawings for the avoidance of doubt.

Main Issue

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

¹ Holborn Studios Ltd v The Council of the London Borough of Hackney (2018)

² Bernard Wheatcroft v Secretary of State for the Environment (1982)

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property comprises a semi-detached dwelling situated in a residential area. Ely Avenue is generally characterised by pairs of two-storey semi-detached dwellings with hipped or gable roofs. Aside from some minor differences, properties appear well balanced and symmetrical. The pairs are separated by regular gaps which provide a pleasant rhythm and a sense of spaciousness to the street scene. The host and adjoining dwelling reflect these characteristics and therefore contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area in these respects.
7. Due to the considerable scale and mass of the proposed development together with the gable roof design, it would be a bulky and obtrusive addition to the host dwelling. The proposal would undermine the balance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellings which is also prevalent in the street scene. Furthermore, due to its close proximity to the side boundary, the side extension would appear cramped in its plot and would erode the spaciousness between the dwellings. Consequently, the proposal would appear as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling and the street scene, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The appellant refers to precedents in the local area, including a hipped to gable roof alteration at 19 Lincoln Avenue. However, other than a photograph of the property I have no other details of this, including the circumstances in which it was implemented. It is also on a different street and is not in the same immediate context as the appeal property. Therefore, this example does not persuade me that the appeal proposal would be acceptable and does not lead me to a different conclusion on the appeal overall.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document for Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan (2024), which requires that developments respect and acknowledge the character and identity of the area including in terms of design, siting, size and scale, amongst other things.

Other Matter

10. I acknowledge the appellant's concerns regarding the way in which the Council worked with the appellant, including a lack of collaboration and opportunity to amend the scheme. However, this does not overcome the harm of the proposed development to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations before me do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

C McDonagh

INSPECTOR