
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2017

by Paul Singleton BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31st January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/3162125

71 Wilton Road, Crumpsall, Manchester M8 4NG

- 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 Mrs Irram Ali against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 112591/FH/2016/N1, dated 22 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of second floor, flat roofed rear extension to form additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at Number 69 Wilton Road with regard to outlook, and on the character and appearance of the street scene in Wilton Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms one half of a semi-detached pairing with Number 69 Wilton Road. With no rear extensions having been carried out at No 69 the existing two storey addition to the appeal property extends by around 2.2 metres (m) beyond the rear elevation of that dwelling. This addition presents a tall blank wall when viewed from the rear windows and rear garden of No 69. Although it would not extend the footprint of the rear addition, the proposed second floor extension, also with a flat roof, would significantly increase the height of that blank wall and the overall bulk of the rear addition. This would result in the rear addition having an unduly overbearing appearance when viewed from the rear windows and rear garden of No 69 and would have a significant adverse effect on the outlook from that property.
 4. The proposal would result in the replacement of the rear roof slope to the original house with a flat roof which would extend from the roof ridge to the rear wall of the rear addition, thereby adding considerable bulk and massing. I do not accept the appellant's contention that the resultant 3-storey addition would appear as subservient to the original dwelling. In my judgement it would be an overbearing addition that would upset the visual balance, both between the extension and the original building and between No 71 and the other half of its semi-detached pairing. The construction of a large, flat
-

roofed and bulky addition at roof level would be out of place with other rear additions to other nearby properties which have achieved a subservient relationship with the host building by means of their scale and design.

5. Although located at the rear of the property the height and bulk of the proposal would mean that it would be visible from the pavement on the opposite side of Wilton Road. It would also be visible from further along Wilton Road, where it crosses the Metrolink line, from where the curvature of the road provides for a clear view of the rear roof slope to No 71 and its existing rear addition. The loss of the rear slope and its replacement with a large flat roofed addition would block out views of the roofs of the houses beyond and introduce a wholly incongruous element into the street scene. That significant and harmful change would also be apparent from the rear gardens of a number of neighbouring houses on the north side of Wilton Road. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the street scene on Wilton Road.
6. Following on from these conclusions I find that the proposal would conflict with saved policy DC1 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan. This states that extensions to residential properties will be allowed provided that they are not excessively large or bulky, resulting in structures which are not subservient to the original house, and that regard should be had to the effect of proposed extensions on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.
7. Policy DC1 notes the desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses to meet changing household needs. However that part of the policy is caveated to the extent that such adaptations should be carried out in appropriate ways and has to read in conjunction with the other parts of the policy. In my view the policy does not give support for the further extension to a property which has already been substantially adapted from its original form and which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
8. The proposal would not comply with Spatial Principle 1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (Core Strategy) which requires that development should make a positive contribution to neighbourhoods and to the health, safety and wellbeing of residents. It would conflict with Core Strategy Policy DM1 which requires that all development should have regard to a number of specific issues including appropriate scale, form and massing and effects on amenity.
9. I note the appellant's reference to the permitted development rights in relation to dormer windows but do not accept that a development carried out in accordance with those rights would have the same harmful effects as the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Singleton

INSPECTOR