
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2020

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/20/3245676

26 Anerley Road, Manchester M20 2DJ

- 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 Rovel Colaco against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 125195/FH/2019, dated 14 October 2019 was refused by notice dated 18 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Hip to gable extension with side roof section extended to the front of the property creating cantilevered roof section. New dormer to the rear'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The host dwelling is situated off the turning head of Annerley Road, forming a small group of 8no. houses in this location. The road on which the host dwelling is sited has a prominent house type, which have their first-floor elevations rendered with brickwork underneath and 2no. storey bay windows on the front elevation, and tiled hipped roofs.
4. The proposed development would involve various works to the roof of the already previously extended property. However, not all of the proposed development would be visible from the street, such as the proposed rear dormer. Nonetheless, the construction works to the roof forming the loft accommodation and the hip to gable conversion would lead to a large expanse of roof slope on the front elevation.
5. The appellant has referenced a number of neighbouring houses in the locality, including No's 11 and 15 Anerley Road, which are close to the site. Whilst noting the presence of these properties, relatively little detail has been provided regarding the planning background to these schemes. Without such information a full and detailed comparison between these developments and the case before me cannot be easily drawn. However, I was able to observe and assess the sites at my visit, and I find on that basis that the other developments cited have little implication for the specific impact of the appeal scheme. In any event, the fact that apparently similar developments may exist is not a reason, on its own, to allow otherwise unacceptable development.

6. There is no specific policy objection to the principle of a residential extension, I note that the appeal scheme would increase the volume of the roof considerably. The host dwelling has retained a clear sense of balance and symmetry relative to the adjoining property, even though it has been previously extended, which accordingly contributes towards a positive feature of the wider street scene.
7. The adverse effect of the proposal is accentuated through the lack of a lower ridge line and the cantilevered overhang proposed above the existing set back of the previous side extension on the front elevation. These design features contribute to the significant increase in bulk and massing of the roof that would, along with the hip to gable conversion itself, diminish and unbalance the character and appearance of the host dwelling to the detriment of the appeal site and the wider street scene. Although the appeal site is located at an oblique angle to the road, it would still be clearly visible from public land, and this would not provide sufficient mitigation to overcome the significant harmful visual effect arising from the proposal.
8. For all of these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would have a significant harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposed development fails to accord with the design, character and appearance aims of Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Council's Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012, 'Saved' Policy DC1 of The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995, and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

9. I have also had regard to various other matters raised by the appellant, including his need to develop a family home, but on the evidence before me this is not a reason to grant permission in the face of the harm identified. The appellant also refers to the absence of local objections and other harm arising from the scheme, these factors, for the reasons described, do not outweigh my assessment of the main issue. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own particular merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

10. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR