
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2026 by S Manson DipTP MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3376371

63 Manor Avenue, Sale, Trafford M33 5JQ

- 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 Syed Hassan against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 117321/HHA/25.
 - The development proposed is described as a “double storey side extension, partial double storey rear extension and single storey rear, removal of existing orangery.”
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is one of a pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings. It appears to have been previously extended to the rear with a single-storey conservatory-style addition. The surrounding area is characterised by semi-detached dwellings of two distinct design types, generally retaining their original form with limited visible alterations. These are set back behind a mature tree-lined verge and pavement, with off-road parking, front gardens, and garages located predominantly to the rear. The consistent spacing between buildings contributes to a sense of openness and rhythm within the street scene. This spacious quality, together with the attractive verdant residential setting, makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. Whilst the proposals would incorporate a set back from the front elevation and step down from the original roof, the two-storey side extension would be built up to the shared boundary with Number 65. This would substantially reduce the obvious separation between the two properties, significantly narrowing the existing gap.
6. There are isolated examples of two storey side extensions within the street scene, however, these are few and far between and are not a defining character of the

area. More commonly, properties incorporate modest single-storey side additions that maintain a clear first-floor separation between dwellings, thereby preserving the area's prevailing sense of openness. In contrast, the remaining gap because of the proposals would be substantially smaller than those typically found in the wider street scene, eroding the established sense of openness and resulting in a cramped appearance that would be harmful to the area's spacious character.

7. The proposed rear dormer, although of a flat-roofed box design, would be modest in scale and contained within the existing roof slope. It would remain subservient to the existing roof form and would not appear dominant. Its window would align with the corresponding one on the first floor below and, being positioned to the rear, would be well screened from public viewpoints. While I acknowledge that there are no comparable flat-roof dormers in the immediate area, its presence as the only example would not, in itself, amount to harm.
8. Nevertheless, this does not alter my earlier findings. The unacceptable harm that would be caused thereby would result in conflict with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, 2022 to 2039 (2024) and guidance contained in the Supplementary Planning Document 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions & Alterations (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework. These, amongst other things, seek to ensure proposals are of a high-quality design, reflect positively to their context, respecting and complementing the form and detailing of the host dwelling and street scene.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. The appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR