
Appeal Decision

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

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/20/3259987
48 Derby Road, Manchester M14 6US

- 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 Khalid Ahmed against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 127005/FH/2020, dated 27 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear 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 Issues

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and living conditions of the occupiers of 46 Derby Road with regard to visual impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The site is located within a well-established residential area characterised by traditionally proportioned and detailed two and three-storey semi-detached and terraced housing with areas of modern infill development. Properties are generally set on distinct building lines and have a robust form and massing.
5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached property located on the corner of Derby Road and Sheringham Road. The property, which reflects the form and design of others in the area has previously been extended by way of a single-storey rear extension, which projects to a depth of approximately 6m and a width around half of the rear elevation, protruding past the side elevation.
6. The proposal involves the infilling of the space between the existing extension and the shared boundary with No.46 Derby Road to the same depth as the

existing by, in effect, replacing one side of the roof with an elongated slope which would have a shallower pitch.

7. The existing extension extends in height to the cill level of the first floor and is a substantial structure. The proposed infill section would add further mass and bulk to the extension, which is visible from the street given its corner location. When viewed from Sheringham Road the enlarged extension would read as an overly dominant addition to the building and to the street scene. Its prominent appearance would be compounded by the proposed asymmetric roof, which would reflect neither the hipped roof of the host dwelling nor the pitched roof of the extension.
8. To conclude on this first main issue, the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the property and the local area. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester City Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document (CS) and saved Policy DC1 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan (UDP). These seek to ensure development has regard to appropriate scale, form and massing while also ensuring extensions are not excessively large or bulky. The proposal would also be contrary to the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which encourages development which is sympathetic to local character.

Living conditions

9. The side of the extension would be positioned close to the shared boundary with No.46, which has windows to the rear at ground floor level. The extension would protrude over the boundary wall by 10cm to the eaves, although given the proximity of the structure the sloping roof would also be visible from the neighbouring property. This additional built form in such close proximity to the common boundary, combined with the 6m length of the extension, would result in an undue sense of enclosure when viewed from the rear windows and garden area of No.46.
10. I acknowledge there are no windows proposed to the side elevation of the new extension. However, to my mind the issue is not one of loss of privacy due to overlooking No.46. Moreover, the lack of objection from occupiers of No.46 is a neutral matter rather than carrying weight in favour of the scheme. As such this does not alter my assessment.
11. For these reasons, and to conclude on the second main issue, the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No.46 Derby Road due to visual impact. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Policies DM1 of the CS and DC1 of the UDP. These seek to ensure development has regard to the effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The proposal would also be contrary to the design aims of the Framework, which encourages a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Recommendation

12. 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

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

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR