



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2021

by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/21/3270627

49 Tottenham Drive, Manchester M23 9WH

- 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 Christopher Hunter against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 127592/FH/2020, dated 28 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side extension to provide additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No 49 is a semi-detached dwelling with dormer windows. The property is situated on a prominent corner plot located within a residential area. The immediate surrounding area is characterised by similarly designed semi-detached dwellings and semi-detached dwellings of a different design to the host dwelling.
4. I observed on my site visit that generally properties situated on corner plots had large gaps to the side boundary. I noted that two-storey side extensions were not a common feature and the design of the dwellings were largely unaltered which results in a uniform appearance.
5. The scheme would not create a terracing effect and matching materials are proposed. A garden would be maintained to the front, side and rear of the property. Nevertheless, it would result in a small gap towards the north eastern boundary and project beyond the building line of the immediate semi-detached dwellings to the south of the appeal site. The proposed extension would be flush with the front and rear elevations and the roofline would match the dwelling. In addition, the width of the extension would exceed half the width of the dwelling.
6. Given No 49's corner plot siting, the scheme would be conspicuous from the surrounding area. The development would harmfully change the character and

appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area because it would not read as a subordinate addition and would be a dominant extension. The scheme would also unbalance the symmetry of the semi-detached properties. This is due to the extension's scale, massing, siting, lack of set back, ridge height and width. Consequently, the scheme would result in an unsympathetic addition and would appear at odds with the established pattern of development.

7. The appellant has referred to other similar extensions. Limited information has been submitted with regards to those cases. I observed on my site visit that two-storey side extensions were not a common feature within the surrounding area. I noted that generally extensions were subservient and did not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling or street scene. In any event, each application must be considered on its own merits.
8. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Accordingly, it would conflict with saved Policies DC1.1 and DC1.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) (UDP) and Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester's Local Development Framework: Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012). These policies seek, amongst other matters, to ensure developments have regard to the character of the surrounding area and host property. The scheme would also not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework which promotes good design and seeks to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character.
9. The Council has referred to saved Policy DC1.3 of the UDP in its reason for refusal. However, based on the evidence submitted and notwithstanding the above conflict with local and national planning policy, I do not consider that the proposal would conflict with this policy.

Other Matters

10. There were no objections to the application, the proposal would not have a significant effect on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers and would be acceptable in terms of vehicle access and car parking. The appellant highlights that the suggested alterations would make the rooms significantly smaller, and the purpose of the extension is to create a forever home as supported by Policy DC1.1. Nonetheless, these are not considerations which outweigh the harm identified above.
11. The appellant has highlighted their frustrations with the Council. Such concerns would be a matter to take up with the Council and they do not impact the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

L M Wilson

INSPECTOR