
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2019

by Alexander Walker MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/19/3229689

1 Reading Close, Manchester M11 1PF

- 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 Stephen Raynolds against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 122938/FH/2019, dated 8 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the living condition of the occupants of neighbouring residential properties, with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is located on the corner of Reading Close and Louisa Street. Although there are commercial properties to the north, the area is primarily residential. Reading Close and Louisa Street generally comprise two-storey, semi-detached and terraced dwellings. Whilst they vary in design, properties follow uniform building lines and their set back positions make a positive contribution to the openness of the area.
4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling that fronts onto Reading Close. Its front elevation follows the building line with other properties on the Close whilst the side elevation of the dwelling clearly follows the building line of the properties on Louisa Street. Whilst there is an existing high, close boarded timber fence on the boundary with Louisa Street, the width of the side garden and the set back position of the existing dwelling from the road makes a positive contribution to the openness of the streetscene.
5. The proposed extension would occupy a significantly large portion of the side garden, extending the dwelling much closer to Louisa Street, thus eroding the contribution it makes to the openness of the streetscene. The extension would also extend beyond the existing building line of the dwellings on Louisa Street and, as a result of its two-storey height, it would unacceptably dominate the

streetscene, particularly when entering/exiting Reading Close. Overall, the extension would fail to respect the existing pattern of development and introduce an incongruous feature into the streetscene. This incongruity would be exacerbated by the size of the extension, which would be almost the size of the existing dwelling and would fail to appear as a subservient addition.

6. The appellant argues that the building line on Louisa Street is not uniform. In support of this, he refers me to Nos 71-95 Louisa Street. However, these are some distance from the appeal site and are read in a different context to the other properties on the Street that are within proximity of the appeal property. Furthermore, he refers me to 2 Reading Close, which is within 4m of the pavement, whereas the appeal property is 6m from it. However, this slight difference is not visually apparent when travelling along Louisa Street. Therefore, I do not consider that the failure of these properties in following the established building line justify the proposal.
7. I find therefore that the proposed extension would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to saved Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (UDP) 1995, which seeks to ensure that development has regard to the character of the area and the overall appearance of the proposal in the streetscene. It would also fail to comply with Policies SP1, EN1 and DM1 of the Manchester City Council's Core Strategy (CS) 2012, which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development has regard to the impact on the surrounding area, protects and enhances the built environment and is of a good design. Furthermore, it would fail to comply with the guidance set out in the Council's Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance 2007, which advises that development should achieve a unified urban form and is of an appropriate height having regard to location and the character of the area.
8. Moreover, it would fail to accord with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Living Conditions

9. As I have identified above, the extension would extend a significant distance beyond the existing building line of properties on Louisa Street. 129 Louisa Street is within proximity of the existing dwelling and the proposed extension. Whilst the extension would be visible from the front windows on No 129, it would only be so from very oblique angles. It would also be visible from a number of other properties, including those on the opposite side of Louisa Street and Reading Close. However, these properties are a sufficient distance from the appeal property to ensure that there would not be any unacceptable overbearing effect and loss of outlook.
10. Therefore, I do not find that the proposal would have any significantly harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring residents, with regard to outlook. As such, I find no conflict in this regard with saved Policy DC1 of the UDP or Policies SP1, EN1 and DM1 of the CS. Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that development protects residential amenity. Furthermore, I find no conflict with the Framework, which similarly seeks to protect residential amenity.

Other Matters

11. The appellant contends that due to the existing boundary fence and a tree in the front garden, the proposal would not have any harmful effect on the visibility for drivers negotiating the access/egress of Reading Close. Based on the evidence before me and the observations made on site, I find no reason to conclude otherwise.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would not have any significantly harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring residential properties, with regard to outlook. Furthermore, it would not have any harmful implications for highway safety. However, these are neutral effects and are attributed no weight in favour of the proposal and therefore do not outweigh the harm I have found with regard to the effect on the character and appearance of the area.
13. For the reasons given above, having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Alexander Walker

INSPECTOR