
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2020

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/20/3258928

1 Glenlea Drive, East Didsbury, Manchester M20 5QJ

- 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 & Mrs Paul Hardman against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 126153/FH/2020, dated 29 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey front extension and single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's Decision Notice as this is more precise.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a predominantly residential area. It is located within a cul-de-sac of properties of a similar style, many of which have been extended and altered.
5. The proposed development includes the erection of a single storey rear extension. The Council have commented that this element of the development would constitute permitted development and would be acceptable development.
6. The element of the development in dispute relates to the proposed two-storey front extension. Due to its scale and forward projection, the two-storey front extension would appear dominant and incongruous in the context of both the host property and the street-scene. On my site visit I observed that none of the other properties in the street had been extended in this manner and I consider that such an overwhelming departure from the established built form of the street would be inconsistent and appear unsightly.

7. Due to its design, scale and siting, it would harmfully unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties. It would incorporate fenestration at the first floor that would be at odds with the rest of the property and appear uncharacteristic and cause harm.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Saved Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) and Policies SP1 and DM1 of Manchester's Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012). Collectively, these policies seek to ensure that development, including residential extensions, has regard to the overall appearance of the proposal in the street-scene, is of appropriate siting, scale, form and massing, with all development protecting and enhancing the built environment.
9. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) (2019) that outlines, amongst other things, that planning decisions should ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture; and that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has referred to a number of other properties in the surrounding area that have been altered in a similar manner to that which is proposed. I observed a number of these on my site visit. Although I do not have the full details of the background in relation to these extensions to other properties, they are crucially in different street-scenes to that of the appeal property. Some of the examples I observed also served to confirm the harm that can be done in relation to inappropriate extensions. I have also, in any event, determined the appeal on its own individual planning merits.
11. I note the personal reasons for seeking to extend the property. These however have little weight in the appeal and do not override the harm I have identified.
12. The appellant has commented that if it would help the appeal, they would be happy to accept the size coming out 2m, not the 3m they applied for on the first application. I am unclear as to what element of the proposal this relates. The rear extension, which projects 3m is not in dispute, whereas the front extension, which is central to the appeal, is shown to project 1.575m. Nevertheless, I do not have any amended plans for consideration, and I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans before me.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR