



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2026

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3375974

2A Wilton Drive, Hale Barns, Trafford WA15 0JF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jaafa Jassm against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 117254/PHAA/25.
 - The development proposed is described as 'erection of an additional storey to the existing dwellinghouse to a maximum overall height of 8.43 metres. Application for prior approval under part 1 of schedule 2 class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the interests of clarity, I have taken the description of development from the decision notice and the appeal form rather than the application form.
3. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of additional storeys subject to limitations and conditions.
4. The Council concluded that, subject to consideration of relevant matters of prior approval, the proposal would comply with the limitations and conditions set out under Class AA of the GPDO, such that it would fall within the scope of such permitted development rights. On the evidence before me I see no reason to conclude differently. The Council has, however, raised concerns in respect of the effect of the development upon the external appearance of the host property and the amenities of the occupants of adjoining properties. My consideration of the appeal shall therefore focus on these matters.
5. In refusing the application, the Council cited policies of the Core Strategy (CS), January 2012, and Places for Everyone (PfE), March 2024. However, the principle of the development is established by the GPDO, and the prior approval provisions does not require regard to be had to the development plan. I can therefore only have regard to any part of such policies that are relevant to an assessment of the

effect of the proposal on amenity and the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

Main Issues

6. I consider that the main issues in this appeal are the impact of the proposed development on:
- the amenity of the occupants of 11, 12, 14 and 16 Elmbridge Drive, in respect of outlook; and
 - the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

Reasons

Amenity

7. The appeal property is constructed close to the side boundary of 11 Elmbridge Drive (No 11), projecting beyond its rear elevation and alongside a significant proportion of the rear garden. As such, the existing two storey dwelling is already seen by the occupiers of No 11.
8. The windows are positioned in the proposed extension to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy to the occupants of adjoining dwellings, including No 11. Nonetheless, the introduction of an additional storey would substantially increase any existing enclosing effect arising from the host property and would dominate views from the rear facing windows and from within the garden of No 11. Consequently, the proposal would create a visual intrusion to the extent that it would be overbearing and thereby detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 11.
9. The proposal would significantly increase the height of the existing dwelling which would increase the prominence of the appeal property when viewed from 12, 14 and 16 Elmbridge Drive. However, given the separation distance between the front windows of those properties and the appeal dwelling, and noting that such properties look towards its narrowest part, I find that the relationship between the proposed development and those properties would be acceptable.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would result in unacceptable harm to the amenity of the occupants of 11 Elmbridge Drive by reason of its effect on outlook. In this regard, it would conflict with CS Policy L7 which seeks to ensure that development does not prejudice the amenity of the occupants of adjacent properties. It would also be contrary to the similar aims of SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (SPD4), February 2012, and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

External appearance

11. The appeal site is within a residential area, comprising two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings of a similar height and which have hipped roofs and two storey bays that sit below eaves level.
12. Although extended, the existing two storey, detached dwelling takes the prevailing forms and facing materials of the locality, including two storey bays and hipped roofs. The height of the existing dwelling is also consistent with the surrounding

houses. As such there is a general uniformity between the appeal property and the others within the street scene which influences how it appears.

13. On approach along Elmbridge Drive from Hale Road, the raised ridge of the proposal would have an imposing presence and would appear distinctly at odds with the consistency and scale of the adjacent dwellings. Furthermore, the windows of the proposed additional storey would largely be above eaves level which would thereby contrast with the existing dwelling and its neighbours. For these reasons, the external appearance of the resulting building would harmfully undermine the cohesive appearance and rhythm of the street scene.
14. For the foregoing reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the external appearance of the dwellinghouse and the local area. It would, therefore, conflict with PfE Policy JP-P1 which requires development, amongst other things, to respect and acknowledge the character and identity of the locality. It would also conflict with the design aims set out in SPD4 and the Framework.

Other Matters

15. I appreciate the appellant's wish to provide further living accommodation. Nonetheless, this does not alter the requirements of the legislation on which I must base my decision or justify the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR