
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2026 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th March 2026

Appeal Ref: 6002769

288 Mauldeth Road West, Manchester M21 7TG

- 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. Edward Ta against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 143311/FH/2025.
 - The development proposed is for a ground & first floor side extension, ground floor rear extension and associated internal works.
-

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.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

3. The Council raised no concern regarding the proposed rear extension, and I find no reason to disagree. My recommendation therefore focuses on the side extension and its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is within a small residential cluster, forming part of a row of detached and semi-detached properties, unified by a cohesive architecture and material palette. The majority of their frontages feature a curved two storey bay window, with decorative hung tiles, a front pitched roof gable with a cladded apex, and an arched brick lintel over the main entrance. These elements are characteristic of the architectural detailing found along the street and this consistency has a positive influence on the traditional and suburban character and appearance of the area.
5. The appeal property is also one of five houses of a similar original design that occupy prominent and large corner plots. They have spacious side gardens and a distinctive two storey bay window to their side elevation. As such, they lend a sense of openness to the junctions leading into the smaller cul-de-sacs, which also contributes positively to the area's character and appearance.
6. The proposal's width would be less than half that of the original house. However, it's ridge and eaves height would align with the host dwelling and be flush with the main front and rear elevations. As such, it's size and scale would create a

continuous and disproportionate non subservient massing, resulting in the host property appearing as an entirely new and noticeably wider dwelling.

7. It would also subsume the entire side elevation, resulting in the loss of the side bay windows. The changes to the front elevation would remove the distinctive architectural features listed above, which would unacceptably erode the host dwelling's originality and disrupt its established architectural composition, diminishing its uniformity with the adjacent houses. The resulting building with its simple and flat design would contrast sharply with the traditional properties nearby.
8. The side garden is generous, and a large gap would remain. However, the proposal would still encroach into this space and the combined effect of its siting, scale, and design would introduce an unduly prominent and obtrusive addition that would unacceptably diminish the open character at the junction head of Endon Drive. This would disrupt the rhythm of spacious side gaps that define the corner plot dwellings along the street. Although mature trees and planting line the boundary, views of the proposal would still be noticeable from public vantage points.
9. The proposal's side projection would extend beyond the building line of Numbers 2 and 4 Endon Drive. However, the host dwelling already projects beyond this and given the considerable distance from these properties, it is not read as part of the same building line. The proposed materials to the walls and roof would match with the host dwelling and surrounding properties. The proposed dark framed openings would also integrate well with the variation in window and door colours in the area.
10. That said, the proposal would still result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policies SP 1 and DM 1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012; saved Policies DC1.1, DC1.2 and DC1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 and the National Planning Policy Framework. Together and amongst other things, these require development proposals to create well designed places, having regard to the surrounding areas. Extensions should also ensure they have regard to the character of the property and that they are subservient to the original house.

Other Matters

11. The planning approval cited at Number 7 Endon Road has not been constructed, but this scheme appears to maintain the original front elevation features and does not relate to a corner plot. It does not strike me as being sufficiently comparable to the point I would find the appeal proposal acceptable. Similarly, the other corner plot extensions cited in the wider area, and which I saw on my site visit, differ in their design and are set within different contexts.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal is dismissed.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR