
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2020 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/19/3241546

34 Averill Street, Manchester, M40 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 Jamie Booth against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 124243/FH/2019, dated 16 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension to existing dwelling, linking house to outbuilding. Conversion of outbuilding to ancillary accommodation with dormer roof extension.
-

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 effect of the proposal on the host property and the character and appearance of the area, having particular regard to the dormer window proposed to the front of the existing outbuilding.

Reasons

4. The appeal site includes a two-storey detached dwelling with an outbuilding to the rear. The immediate area comprises a mix of property types, building lines and use of materials. As such, there is no defined local character. Nevertheless, the roofscape along Averill Street lacks significant additions and dormer extensions on prominent roof planes are not a common feature within the surrounding area.
5. The proposed development includes a dormer extension to the outbuilding, on the roof plane facing the host dwelling. The building is single storey and lower than the main dwelling. It is also sited to the rear of No 34 however it is highly visible when viewed from Averill Street due to the forward siting of the host dwelling and good spacing between adjacent buildings. Furthermore, it has a generous ridge height and steep roof pitch which increases its prominence from public vantage points. It follows that I disagree with the appellant's point that

the existing outbuilding is not prominent or visible in public views from Averill Street.

6. The proposed dormer would be set down slightly from the ridge line, however it would span much of the full width of the building and would lack a legible set-back from the eaves. As such, due to its coverage across much of the front roof plane, it would not read as a subservient extension but rather a substantial and top-heavy addition. This would be exacerbated further by its flat-roof design, which would introduce a horizontal emphasis which would be at odds with the vertical and traditional proportions of the outbuilding. Furthermore, due to its overall scale, massing and positioning, this proposal would be highly noticeable and read as an overly dominant and incongruous feature in the wider street scene.
7. I acknowledge that the proposed dormer would create more usable floorspace by increasing the headroom at the roof level of the outbuilding. However, that does not outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the effect on character and appearance from public vantage points.
8. Consequently, taking all the above into consideration, the proposed dormer extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and wider area and is contrary to policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, 1995, and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy, 2012, which collectively seek to ensure, amongst other things, that developments have regard to the character of the property and the surrounding area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Hannah Ellison

Appeal Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

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

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR