
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2019 by Hilary Senior BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

by Susan Ashworth BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/T4210/D/19/3228612

117 Prestwich Hills, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 9PY

- 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 Nadeem Younis against the decision of Bury Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 63855, dated 24 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is remodelling and alteration and extension to house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer 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 proposal on the character and appearance of 117 Prestwich Hills and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Prestwich Hills is the main access into a suburban, open plan estate with landscaped gardens and limited boundary treatments. The area mainly comprises detached properties, and is located adjacent to St Mary's Conservation Area. The property is a corner plot in a prominent location at the entrance to the estate, bounded by Prestwich Hills to the front and side and Butterstile Lane to the rear. It is on a sloping site, at a higher level to Butterstile Lane, which is the conservation area boundary. It is the first property in a row of bungalows, although there are two storey properties opposite, and has gardens to front side and rear.
5. The appeal scheme proposes several additions to the existing dwelling including increasing the ridge and eaves height, two pitched dormers to both the front and rear and a rear balcony. It also includes a single storey rear extension, a side extension and a porch to the front elevation.

6. Permission was granted in February 2019 for a similar extension to the property¹. That permission is still capable of being implemented and is therefore a material consideration which carries significant weight. The appeal proposal would increase the ridge height and eaves height and would change the dormers by removing the set back from the eaves, when compared to the approved scheme.
7. The existing permission would undoubtedly alter the form and appearance of the bungalow which is a modest single storey building with traditional detailing. However, the scheme before me would result in a poorly proportioned building, with unusually high eaves for a dwelling of this height and a disproportionate amount of masonry walling. The resulting dwelling would neither reflect the appearance of a bungalow nor the traditionally designed two-storey houses nearby.
8. Dormer windows are not generally a feature of properties in the area. Nevertheless, the dormers approved as part of the previous permission would be modest structures that would sit comfortably within the roof slope, set down from the ridge, and away from the eaves. As such they would generally respect the design criteria for dormer windows set out in the Supplementary Planning Document 6 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties (January 2010) (SPD). Whilst I acknowledge that the dormers now proposed would be set in from the sides of the property as recommended in the SPD, they would punctuate the eaves and thereby not respect the form of the building. Moreover, as a result of their position, they would be prominent and incongruous features on both the front and back of the building.
9. Consequently, the proposal, which would also result in a significant increase in the scale and massing of the building compared with the approved scheme, would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the original building.
10. As a result of its highly prominent position within the residential area, the changes to the building would be clearly apparent from the public realm. Whilst the building would be no higher than two storey properties locally, as a result of its massing and incongruous design it would be a jarring building that would detract from the character and appearance of the area. I acknowledge the appellant's point that the building would no more prominent than the approved scheme. However, for the above reasons it would be considerably more harmful.
11. The site, due to the topography, is highly visible from within the conservation area. Whilst the two neighbouring areas have distinct characters, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires, in paragraph 194, clear and convincing justification for any harm from development within the setting of a designated heritage asset. Given that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the residential development within which it is located, there would also be some limited harm to the setting of the conservation area.
12. I have had regard to the appellant's desire for enhanced family accommodation. However, I am not persuaded that any private benefit in this

¹ Application number 63640 Approved subject to conditions 12 February 2019

respect would outweigh the harm I have identified and would not justify the harm to the setting of the conservation area.

13. For the reasons set out above the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of 117 Prestwich Hills and the wider street scene. It would therefore conflict with saved Policy H2/3 Alterations and Extensions of the Bury Unitary Development Plan (August 1997), the SPD which seeks to ensure that extensions complement the original building, and the Framework, particularly Chapter 12 which seeks to ensure developments are sympathetic to the local area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR