

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 September 2017

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/17/3179020

4 Mersey Meadows, Manchester M20 2GB ☐

- 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 Anthony Carpenter against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 116044/FH/2017, dated 21 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 19 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a single storey side extension. The design includes a lean-to roof but the extension would be too wide to accommodate a roof pitch that would match that of the main house. The width of the extension and its limited height would result in it having an uncharacteristically squat appearance. Its scale, particularly its roof, would dominate the side facing gable. As the side of the house shares a building line with the frontage of the adjacent property, 2 Mersey Meadows, it would be a prominent feature when viewing that property. It would also significantly reduce the level of openness of this corner plot which is important to the appearance of the area.
 4. Although there are a variety of building lines and differing relationships between houses in the area, setting a side extension of this design and scale, in front of the building line of the neighbouring dwelling, would detract from the existing composition of these properties. Whilst the materials and detailing would reflect those of the dwelling, this would not result in a development with sufficient architectural quality to sit comfortably in such a prominent location. It would dominate both the existing gable and the appearance and setting of the neighbouring property.
 5. Overall, the loss of openness would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area and this harm would be compounded by the introduction of an extension of uncharacteristic proportions that would
-

- dominate the frontage of the adjacent dwelling and this corner plot. It represents poor design that does not have sufficient regard for this particular context. It would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.
6. As the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the area, it would be contrary to the design objectives of policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012; policy DC1 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan 1995 (UDP); and the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance 2007. As these seek to create well designed places that reinforce and enhance local character, they are consistent with the design aspirations of the *National Planning Policy Framework* and can be afforded considerable weight.
 7. The Council have accepted a similar extension to this property. The approved plans would result in a narrower addition but it would also reduce the openness of this corner plot, albeit to a lesser extent. It would have a similar pitch to the lean-to roof but its narrower depth would result in more satisfactory proportions that would be more in keeping with those of the existing house. It would also be a more subservient addition. Its impact would not therefore be as harmful as the proposal before me. The approved plans do not therefore suggest that a similar extension of greater scale should be accepted.
 8. The Council previously refused a side extension of a differing design which was dismissed at appeal. That design sought to reflect the form of the main dwelling but its overall scale and the loss of openness were found to result in harm to the character of the area. Whilst this proposal would result in an addition of lesser bulk, it would nevertheless be unacceptably dominant and it would similarly reduce the openness of this corner plot to the detriment of the appearance of the area.
 9. I have had regard to other extensions that have been referred to by the appellant within this area. However, this is a particularly exposed location where a side extension would be a prominent new feature within the street scene. The relationship of this property to its neighbour is also of importance. The other developments are not directly comparable with the particular circumstances of this case.
 10. I have considered all the matters put forward by the appellant, including the beneficial internal layout that would be achieved by the greater width of the extension. This gains some support from UDP policy DC1. However, I conclude that there are no matters that are sufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR