



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2026

by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/W/25/3375208

64 Manor Avenue, Sale, Trafford M33 5JR

- 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 Satyendar Duddukuri against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref is 116547/COU/25.
 - The development proposed is 'retrospective erection of rear dormer and retrospective change of use from a single dwelling (Use Class C3) to a small House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) with a total of 6 bedrooms and a maximum occupancy of 6 persons (Use Class C4) with associated cycle/refuse storage area.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development above has been taken from the appeal form and the Council's decision notice, rather than the application form, as it is more precise.
3. The Council's reason for refusal concerns only one element of the development, specifically the rear dormer. Accordingly, in my assessment below, I have considered only the disputed element of the development.
4. At the time of my site visit, the dormer was in place. The development is therefore retrospective, and I have considered it on this basis.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and of the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached, brick-built, pitched-roofed dwelling located on the western side of Manor Avenue, in a predominantly residential area. The appeal dwelling is set back from the road, has a private drive to the front and a garden to the rear.
7. Permission is sought for a flat-roofed rear dormer, which has a box-like form and projects along most of the width of the original roof of the dwelling, without being set down from the main ridge. It is only slightly set in from the sides and set up from the eaves level. Thus, it covers a significant proportion of the rear slope of the property, and it forms a top heavy, dominant feature that does not reflect the style or form of the original roof.

8. Its external material appears to be a dark-coloured horizontal boarding. Such material does not reflect the materials used in the construction of the host dwelling and its extensive use led to the discordant appearance of the structure to the rear of the property. I note that the dormer window aligns with the openings at first-floor and ground-floor levels below. However, notwithstanding this alignment, due to a combination of its siting, form, overall bulk, and materials, the dormer fails to appear as a subordinate and proportionate addition to the host dwelling.
9. The dormer does not have a prominent position within the street scene, as it is only partly visible from Manor Avenue. However, it is clearly visible from the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties. Given its inappropriate relationship with the host dwelling and its jarring contrast with both the host dwelling and the nearby dwellings, the dormer also harms the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
10. The appellant has suggested that a condition could be imposed to secure the use of matching materials for the rear dormer. However, given my findings above, the matching materials alone would not be sufficient to overcome the identified harm.
11. In conclusion, the development has an unacceptably harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and of the surrounding area. Thus, it conflicts with the aims of Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document for Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan 2022 to 2039 adopted 2024, which requires developments, amongst other things, to respect the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used. It also conflicts with the aims of paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which requires developments to be sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment. I give significant weight to this conflict.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has drawn my attention to several other flat-roofed rear dormers within the area and to several applications for certificates of lawful development for rear dormers¹. However, I have not been provided with substantive evidence to demonstrate that the neighbouring rear dormers are directly comparable to the appeal scheme. In respect of the certificates of lawful development, they are determined on the basis of lawfulness rather than planning merits and therefore differ materially from the appeal scheme before me. In any event, I have considered the appeal development based on its own merits and site-specific circumstances.
13. The appellant contends that the dormer could have benefited from permitted development rights under the General Permitted Development Order had matching materials been used. However, whether the rear dormer would have constituted permitted development is not for me to consider in the context of this appeal. I have therefore dealt with the appeal development on its own merits and site-specific circumstances.
14. The development, with the exception of the dormer element assessed above, was found acceptable by the Council in all other respects. On the basis of the evidence

¹ LPA refs: 117064/CPL/25; 115902/CPL/25; Ref 114508/CPL/24; Ref 114187/CPL/24.

before me, I have no reason to reach a different conclusion. However, these considerations are neutral and do not weigh positively in favour of the development.

15. I acknowledge the intention to provide quality accommodation in a sustainable residential location. However, this does not address, nor outweigh, the harm identified above in relation to the rear dormer element of the development, with particular regard to its impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

16. The latest information is that the Council is able to demonstrate a housing land supply of only 4.7 years. Therefore, due to the housing land supply position, paragraph 11 d) of the Framework is engaged.
17. The appeal development replaces one form of housing with another. No benefits to the supply of housing were demonstrated. Therefore, the adverse impacts of the rear dormer element of the development, with regard to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and of the surrounding area, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any modest benefits from delivering a single HMO. As a result, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.
18. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

INSPECTOR