



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2026

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/W/25/3375759

42 & 44 Auburn Road, Old Trafford, Stretford, Manchester M16 9NT

- 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 Rashied Saeed against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 117127/FUL/25.
 - The development proposed is No.42 Part Single-storey rear extension, No.44 Part Single-storey rear/side extension, loft conversion dormer extension, annexe extension & conversion into sleeping accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal includes a single-storey rear extension to 42 Auburn Road (No 42), and single-storey rear/side extension, annexe extension and conversion into sleeping accommodation at 44 Auburn Road (No 44). The Council has raised no objections to these elements and based upon the information provided and my observations on site, I have no reason to disagree.
3. Revised elevations plans were submitted with the appeal that amend the proposed dormer extension. However, corresponding revised floor plans were not also submitted and, therefore, a complete set of plans fully describing the development in its amended form is not before me. As I do not have a full set of amended plans, and in the interests of fairness, I have determined the appeal based on the plans that were before the Council when it made its decision

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed loft conversion and dormer extension, on the character and appearance of 44 Auburn Road and the area.

Reasons

5. 42 and 44 Auburn Road are a pair of two-storey semi-detached properties within a residential area characterised by semi-detached dwellings. The host properties are located within a street where the dwellings have hipped roofs on one side, which is where the appeal site is located, and gable roofs on the other. The surrounding area is residential and suburban in character, with rows of dwellings of a similar architectural style.

6. Many of the houses within the vicinity of the site have been altered and extended in various ways, contributing to a diverse street scene. Hip to gable roof extensions, large rear dormers and side dormers with dual pitched roofs are common features. This includes 40 Auburn Road (No 40), the semi-detached dwelling next to No 42, where a full hip to gable alteration and large rear dormer have been constructed.
7. Based on the evidence before me, and from my observations during the site visit, many rear dormers are visible from the nearby streets in the gaps between dwellings, including the rear dormer at No 40. Comparable to other dormer extensions within the area, the proposed dormer would have a flat roof, would be in line with the main roof ridge of No 44, and would extend across almost its full roof width. It would, however, project along the side elevation of the existing dwelling to a point close to the rear wall of the existing two storey rear extension. Consequently, it would be considerably larger than any of the existing dormer extensions in the surrounding area and of a scale that would be a disproportionately large flat roofed addition to the dwelling. Given that it would be visible from public vantage points it would be seen as an incongruous and intrusive feature in the street scene and would dominate the roof to the detriment of the character and appearance of No 44 and the area.
8. It is not uncommon to find semi-detached pairs having differing roof designs, thus disturbing the symmetry and balance. Many such examples near to the appeal site have been brought to my attention, albeit, other than the example in the adjoining pair that I have referred to above, not within the immediate street scene. Nonetheless, based upon my observations, the absence of the original symmetry of semi-detached dwellings, and a variety of roof form is now characteristic of the residential area within which the appeal site lies.
9. Whilst the bulk and appearance of No 44 would change, and the balance that exists between the pair of semi-detached dwellings would be lost, the proposed hip to gable extension would relate well to the surrounding built environment and would be in keeping with common features that contribute to the character of the area.
10. I acknowledge that the hip to gable alterations within the area have been carried out using permitted development rights and have, therefore, not been assessed against development plan policies or adopted guidance. However, this does not prevent them from forming part of, and thus being characteristic of, the street scape within which the appeal site is located. Moreover, it is reasonable to consider that such permitted development rights will be exercised more widely in the area and that such alterations will become even more commonplace in the future.
11. I am, therefore, not persuaded that the proposed hip to gable loft conversion would be incongruous or an unsympathetic or harmful change to the character and appearance of No 44 or the area, where gable ends are a common feature. This does not, however, alter my findings in respect of the proposed dormer extension.
12. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed dormer extension would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of No 44 and the area. As such, the proposal would conflict with Policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone, March 2024 which, amongst other things, requires development to acknowledge the

character and identity of the locality. It would also be contrary to the similar aims of SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations, February 2012, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

13. I note the concerns expressed about the Council's handling of the planning application. However, such matters are not relevant to my findings on the planning merits of the scheme and, therefore, fall outside of the remit of this decision.
14. I acknowledge that the proposal would not result in harm to living conditions of neighbouring occupants. Nevertheless, this is a neutral factor that does not weigh in favour of, or against, the proposal.

Conclusion

15. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
16. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR