



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 7 July 2021

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/21/3268695

14 Montcliffe Crescent, Manchester M16 8GR

- 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 Shakil Ahmed against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 127267/FH/2020, dated 26 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of first floor side extension to form additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the appeal was submitted, the revised National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) came into force on 20 July 2021. I have taken this into consideration in determining this appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling which is situated in an area that contains a variety of properties, including two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings as well as bungalows. Many of the properties have been extended, although the setting back of buildings from the road, as well as the largely open frontages, which are laid out as lawned gardens with some trees, gives the area an open, verdant character.
5. The proposal would see the erection of a first-floor extension over a single storey element to the side of the main two storey section of the dwelling. The extension would result in a two-storey structure close to the footway. Given the scale and elevated form of the proposal, it would appear as a dominant addition to the property. I was able to see the space in front of the houses on the opposite side of Montcliffe Crescent to the appeal site, which are set back on a short spur from the main carriageway. However, despite this generous spacing, the appeal property is sited on the other side of Montcliffe Crescent in a prominent corner location, where the proposal would have a cramped appearance. Whilst the trees to the front would soften the appearance of the appeal proposal and offer some screening, the extension would nevertheless be

clearly seen from various public vantage points and unacceptably harm the spacious character of the area.

6. I note the variety of houses in the area and that the proposal has sought to create from the extension and the existing main building, a new, individually designed house. The resultant building would be of a similar size to some other houses in the area and although there is variation in the building line and the positioning of buildings within their plots, the surrounding buildings are nevertheless set back from the highway. As such, whilst the detailed design of the proposal is acceptable, and the appellant would ensure high quality workmanship, the loss of spaciousness in this highly visible corner location would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area.
7. I therefore conclude that the appeal development would have an unacceptable harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy DC1 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan and Policy DM 1 of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document, which seek, amongst other matters, for development to have regard to the character of the surrounding area. It would also be contrary to paragraph 130 of the Framework, which requires, amongst other matters, development that is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

8. The Council have raised concerns relating to the loss of residential amenity to occupiers of surrounding properties. However, given the distance to buildings across Montcliffe Crescent, which are separated from the side of the appeal site by the highway itself and the front garden and parking areas of these neighbouring properties, there would not be any overbearing impact on those occupiers or to those of the neighbouring property at the rear.
9. I appreciate the appellant is seeking to provide larger accommodation, and the reference to the planning system needing to accommodate demand for more living space. It is however also necessary to consider the effect on the character of the area arising from a development. I have found in the case of this appeal proposal, that it would have a detrimental impact in this regard and this matter, nor the supporting comments from neighbours, would outweigh this harm.
10. The appellant has made reference to other properties that have been extended elsewhere on the estate. I have been provided with limited details of these extensions and am not aware of their full circumstances. In any case, I consider the examples, some of which show properties extended close to the pavement on corner plots, do little to support the proposal and serve to demonstrate the harm that would be caused by the appeal development.

Conclusion

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

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR