



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 22 January 2021

by R Morgan BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/20/3260858
136 Errwood Road, MANCHESTER, M19 1HT

- 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 Ms Soraya Begum against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 127358/FH/2020, dated 6 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part single, part two storey rear extension, hip to gable conversion and dormer to rear, to provide additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of development from the appeal form and decision notice, which more accurately describes the proposal than that shown on the application form.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - i) the character and appearance of the area
 - ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 134 and 138 Errwood Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Errwood Road, and the residential streets which lead off it, are characterised by semi-detached houses of a similar style and age. The properties are notable in that few appeared to have been extended, nor their external appearance substantially altered.
5. The proposed replacement of the existing hipped roof with a gable at 136 Errwood Road (No. 136), would involve a significant and fundamental change to the shape of the roof, which would be clearly visible from the street. This would unbalance the overall appearance of the pair of houses. The proposed alteration to the roof shape would appear incongruous and out of character

with other properties in the street, the vast majority of which have retained their original hipped roof form.

6. The proposed rear dormer would occupy the full height and width of the extended roof, so would have the appearance of an additional storey rather than a roof extension. This feature, when combined with the considerable scale and length of the rear extensions, would appear overly large and bulky in relation to the host property, rather than being subservient to it.
7. Whilst the proposed extensions at the rear of the property would not be easily seen from Errwood Road or Arbor Avenue, they would be clearly visible from the rear windows of surrounding houses, particularly those on Arbor Avenue, which look directly onto the rear garden of the appeal property. The differing roof forms of the single storey and two storey extensions, together with the partial step-in at first floor level, would appear awkward, and would fail to respect the character of the existing house and wider area.
8. Due to its scale and design, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would fail to comply with Saved Policies DC1.1, DC1.2 and DC1.3 of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester 1995 (UDP), which require that residential extensions have regard to the general character of the property and their appearance in the streetscene; that proposals should not be excessively large or bulky; and that rearward extensions greater than 3.65m and two storey flat roof extensions should be avoided.
9. The proposal also conflicts with Policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012 (Core Strategy), which require that development should have regard to, and enhance, the character of the surrounding area. There is further conflict with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which contains similar objectives.

Living conditions

10. At ground floor level, the proposed extensions would take up most of the width of the existing house, save for a small set back from the shared boundary with the adjoining semi, 138 Errwood Drive (No. 138). The long extension would introduce new solid built form in very close proximity to No. 138. The incorporation of a mono pitch roof on the ground floor element would result in the development being of considerable height for most of its substantial length. The existing shared boundary fence would be insufficient to provide adequate screening, and the proposal would appear overbearing when viewed from the rear windows and garden of the adjoining property. Despite the proposed set back at first floor level, the proposal would feel oppressive, and would create an unacceptable sense of enclosure for the occupiers of No. 138.
11. The properties along Errwood Road take up most of their plot widths, with fairly narrow gaps between them. As the proposed extension would continue the line of the existing side elevation of the appeal property, it would also be close to the shared boundary with 134 Errwood Road (No. 134). The proposed roof alterations and extensions would add significantly to the overall bulk of the appeal property, and due to its scale and proximity to the shared boundary, the proposed development would feel overbearing for the occupiers

of No. 134. This effect would be exacerbated by the relative siting of the two properties, with No. 134 being slightly further forward in its plot.

12. The proposed rear extensions would stretch for much of the length of the garden of No. 134, which is notably shorter than that of No. 136. Due to the scale of the proposed development, the result would be to enclose the garden space of No. 134 to an unacceptable degree. Furthermore, the orientation of the two properties, with No. 134 positioned to the north of No. 136, means that the proposal would result in additional overshadowing of the rear habitable rooms and garden of No. 134, particularly during the afternoon.
13. I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 134 and 138 Errwood Road, with particular regard to outlook. The proposal would conflict with Saved UDP Policy DC1.1, which requires that proposals have regard to the effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, and DC1.2, which requires that they do not create an undue loss of sunlight or daylight. For similar reasons, the proposal fails to comply with Core Strategy Policy DM1. Conflict also exists with Framework paragraph 127, concerning the need for a high standard of amenity for existing users.
14. Saved UDP Policy DC1.3 and Core Strategy Policy SP1 are not directly applicable to this second main issue.

Other Matters

15. I acknowledge that individual elements of the scheme, including roof alterations and single storey rear extensions of up to 6 metres, can fall within permitted development rights. However, the scale of the proposed extensions means that these rights do not apply in this case, and planning permission is required. This necessitates an assessment of all elements of the proposal in light of relevant planning policies and other material considerations.
16. Although the plot is of sufficient size to physically accommodate the proposed extensions, I have found that the scheme would be harmful to both the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Despite the lack of objections from the neighbouring occupiers, the proposal fails to comply with relevant policies, and is not acceptable.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R. Morgan

INSPECTOR