



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 25 May 2021

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/21/3268332

44 Brooklawn Drive, Manchester M20 3GZ

- 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 David John against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 128526/FH/2020, dated 6 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side elevation extension on top of existing single story to form bedroom with en-suite bathroom and addition of a dormer window to an existing roofline loft conversion to increase size of existing loft bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The design of the roof of the proposed extension to the side elevation was amended during the course of the application to include a hipped roof. I have assessed the appeal based on these amended plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed double storey extension to the side elevation on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling located within a row of houses of the same design which are positioned in a linear arrangement fronting onto Brooklawn Drive. Due to its positioning opposite Roseland Avenue, it occupies a particularly prominent position in the respective street scenes. As is the case with many of the dwellings in the area, it has been altered, with a gable roof having replaced the original hipped roof and ground floor extensions. Notwithstanding this, the general uniformity of the appearance of dwellings along this side of Brooklawn Drive and their consistent spacing in relation to one another contributes positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
5. The proposal would extend the first floor of the property so that its side elevation would be immediately adjacent to the common boundary with 42 Brooklawn Drive. Its front elevation would be level with the main front elevation of the host dwelling, meaning that it would sit slightly back from the projecting part of the property where the front door is located. However, the roof line to the front of the dwelling would follow that of the existing, and the hipped roof over the proposed extension would rise to the same height as the ridge of the existing dwelling.

6. This design means that the proposed extension would not appear subservient to the host dwelling. Subserviency is an important and necessary consideration in this instance, given the relatively narrow gaps between the dwellings and the fact that this would be substantially eroded. It is also needed to prevent the proposed extension from visually dominating the host dwelling. Furthermore, if the adjacent dwelling at No 42 was to seek to undertake the same extension, there would be a harmful terracing effect arising, even with the hipped roof that is proposed.
7. The delegated officer report discusses other examples of two storey side extensions to properties in the vicinity of the appeal site, some of which have setbacks and lower ridge heights and some which do not. The Council considers that the more recently permitted developments have taken the approach they advocate in respect of the appeal development. From my observations during my site visit, those that have setbacks and lower roof heights have much more successfully integrated with respect to both their host dwelling and the area. Furthermore, those without do not appear to be so numerous as to define the character and appearance of the area. In any event, I must determine the appeal proposal primarily on its own merits, and that is the approach I have taken.
8. I acknowledge that the appellant has amended the scheme to attempt to address matters raised by the Council. However, this has failed to adequately overcome the concerns regarding the overall impact of the proposed side extension, its subserviency to the host dwelling and its impact upon the surrounding area.
9. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed double storey extension to the side elevation would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal fails to accord with Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 and Saved Policy DC1 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan 1995, where they seek to protect character and appearance.

Conclusion

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

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR