
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020 by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/20/3259746
20 Deerhurst Drive, Manchester M8 0TJ

- 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 Mrs Chinar Rashid against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 127033/FH/2020, dated 30 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'a front porch with the size 5m(width)x2m(length) with a maximum height of 3 meters. The roof would be a lean-to roof'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mrs Chinar Rashid against Manchester City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a two-storey, end-terrace dwelling with a gable roof. The dwelling features front and rear gardens with the host terrace set around a central square. The proposal involves the erection of a single storey front extension with a pitched roof to form additional living space.
5. Due to its width, height and roof style, the extension would add significant bulk to the front of the property, which is highly visible from the street given the open space to the front which will remain. The form and contrasting roof design would be at odds with that of the original dwelling and would appear as an incongruous addition to the host property. It would also appear out of character with the terrace given the houses are largely unaltered to the front, with only a few door canopies breaking the established front building line. The use of matching materials would not be sufficient to make the extension acceptable. Accordingly, the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host property and local area.

6. To conclude on the main issue, the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and local area. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester City Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document and Policy DC1 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan. These seek to ensure development has regard to appropriate scale, form and massing while also ensuring extensions are not excessively large or bulky.

Other Matters

7. The appellant states that no objections were received from any of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties. However, the lack of objection is a neutral matter rather than carrying weight in favour of the scheme. Moreover, while I note the purpose of the extension is to improve the layout of the house to provide additional living space, this is a private benefit which carries limited weight.
8. I note the assertion that the proposal is within permitted development limits. I have nothing before me to substantiate this. Regardless, this is not for me to determine within the context of a section 78 appeal and I have assessed the proposal as it was presented.

Recommendation

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

C McDonagh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR