



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2025 by L Cuthbertson

Decision by T Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3376003

6 Hampden Road, Sale, Trafford M33 7UB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jonathan Brenchley against the decision of the Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 117200/HHA/25.
 - The proposed development is a two-storey side extension.
-

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 dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is an end-of-terrace dwelling forming part of a row of four terraced, two-storey dwellings sharing a consistent design and layout that is typical of the area. The street scene has a uniform and balanced character, with terraces arranged in sets separated by characteristic gaps. These gaps provide visual relief and contribute positively to the spacious feel and pleasant rhythm of the street, which is an important aspect of its character and appearance.
5. The proposed development would extend up to the shared boundary with No. 4 Hampden Road, substantially reducing the existing gap. Although the extension would be set back from the front elevation and feature a lowered ridge height, these measures would not mitigate the fundamental impact of closing the gap. The development would erode the visual break between the terraces, creating an impression of continuous built form and excessive terracing along the street. This would result in a marked departure from the established pattern of development.
6. The loss of this gap would noticeably diminish the spaciousness of the street scene and disrupt the established pattern and rhythm of development. The resulting appearance would be cramped, unbalanced and over-dominant, particularly given

the property's position at the end of the terrace, creating an impression of excessive terracing along the road. The increase in massing would visually encroach on the adjacent semi-detached pair at Nos. 2 and 4 Hampden Road, reducing the sense of separation and openness that currently exist.

7. My attention has been drawn to examples of extensions at nearby properties. Although some properties in the vicinity are built up to the boundary, substantial gaps are still retained between neighbouring properties that preserve the sense of openness. In contrast, the proposed extension would significantly reduce the gap, undermining this important feature of the street scene.
8. The proposal would conflict with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document for Bolton, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan (2024) which seeks to ensure that extensions respect local character, maintain visual gaps and avoid creating a cramped or overcrowded appearance. It would also conflict with the guidance contained within the Trafford Council Supplementary Planning Document SPD 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions & Alterations (2012). This seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that developments do not erode the sense of spaciousness within an area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For these reasons, the proposed development would, by virtue of its scale, massing and siting in close proximity to the common boundary, result in a cramped form of development and a loss of spaciousness that is harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the street scene. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

L Cuthbertson

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.

T Law

INSPECTOR