
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2016

by Mrs Zoë Hill BA(Hons) Dip Bldg Cons(RICS) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 16 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/16/3160926

1 Albemarle Avenue, Manchester M20 1HX

- 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 Richard Dodd against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref: 111365/FH/2016/S1, dated 22 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and loft conversion including increased ridge height.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached inter-war dwelling situated near to a road junction. The house is constructed of red brick, with some feature tile hanging. The front elevation has a two storey bow window under a gable. The rear elevation has an existing single storey extension over about half the width of the house.
 4. The other dwellings within the cul-de-sac on the same side of the road are similar in design but include semi-detached houses such as that next door. Further down the street on the opposite side there is a listed building but the separation and relationship is such that the proposed development would not impact upon its setting. The neighbouring dwelling at the junction, whilst detached, is different in design to the appeal property. I also saw that there are dwellings of differing style and design which can be seen from the rear garden of the appeal property. These include taller modern buildings and taller Victorian properties. Nonetheless, the streetscene in which the appeal property is situated has a cohesive character.
 5. The elevational treatment and materials of the proposed extensions have been chosen to reflect the design of the host property. However, in order to create the additional space sought, particularly in the loft space, the roof would be significantly altered and the roof of the proposed two storey side extension would have an unacceptably bulky form even though it would run into the main
-

- roof at a lower level than its highest point. In particular the new and altered roof would require a steeper pitch than existing and use of flat roof areas.
6. While the appellant suggests this would not be perceived as out of character I disagree. The proportions of the host dwelling would be significantly altered detracting from the form of the existing dwelling. In effect the mass and bulk of the roof would become uncharacteristically dominant. Moreover, the extensions, taken together, would appear markedly different to the neighbouring properties and so detract from the harmony of the streetscene. In this regard I accept that there may be variation in roof heights and pitches in the vicinity but what matters is how the proposal, taken as a whole, relates to the building and its surroundings.
 7. The single storey rear extension is less dominant being at the rear of the property and of a lower form. However, it is part of the integral design and so cannot be considered in isolation.
 8. Notwithstanding the use of matching materials, the positive design details and the fact that this is a detached property, I conclude that the massing, bulk and height of the proposed two storey and roof extensions/alterations are such that the proposal would dominate the host property and detract from its character and that of the streetscene. The harm I have identified also brings the proposal into conflict with policies SP 1 and EN 1 of the Manchester Local Development Framework Core Strategy (July 2012) which, amongst other things, seek to reinforce and enhance local character.
 9. It would also conflict with saved policy DC1 of the Manchester Plan, The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) insofar as it would fail to respect the streetscene. In this respect I note the policy is dated and is prescriptive to the extent that it does not fully accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) lessening the weight that should be afforded to it. However, in terms of this case the requirements of this policy broadly reflect the more recent Core Strategy.
 10. The guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document referred to by the appellant similarly explains that design should have regard to its context and the character of the area. It is correct that varied heights and styles may be appropriate in differing locations, but for the reasons set out above, this scheme is not acceptable in this location.
 11. The appellant highlights those aspects of the proposal which have not resulted in objection. However, lack of material harm in respect of privacy or light for the adjoining properties does not outweigh the harms identified in terms of character and appearance. I have not attached weight to the matter of precedent which is referred to by the appellant.
 12. I have found that the proposal would conflict with the development plan. Moreover, it would fail to accord with the Framework in that it seeks to always secure a high quality design. In this case I find this would not arise, rather the scheme would be harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene. Thus, the appeal shall fail.

Zoë Hill

Inspector