



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2022

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/21/3289479

14 Holmside Gardens, Manchester M19 1WR

- 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 and Mrs Jonathan and Safia Smith and Azra-Smith against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 131438/FH/2021, dated 16 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is the retention of a two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the retention of a two storey rear extension at 14 Holmside Gardens, Manchester M19 1WR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 131438/FH/2021, dated 16 August 2021, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

2. The extension subject of this appeal has been built on site in accordance with the submitted plans. Although I understand that the extension was built by the previous owners, I have considered the proposal on its own planning merits.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on: the living conditions of the occupants of 16 Holmside Gardens with regards to outlook, sunlight, daylight and overbearingness; and the amenity of the surrounding residential area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is semi-detached and lies at the head of a cul-de-sac containing residential properties of a similar, scale, massing and design. The other half of the semi-detached pairing has a single storey extension to the rear. There are two first floor bedroom windows also in the rear elevation.
5. The extension projects away from the property's original rear elevation by around 3 metres and extends across its full width up to the party boundary with No. 16. This is not in conflict with saved Policy DC1.3 of The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (UDP). Even if the extension didn't, having regard to the site and its surroundings, the extension sits slightly behind the rear building line of the single storey extension at No. 16. Moreover, the eaves line of the proposal appropriately joins up with the host dwelling and its design responds to the traditional character and appearance of the host dwelling and those nearby.

6. While the ridge line could have potentially been set down from the ridge line of the host dwelling, the effect of not doing so does not, on balance, in tandem with the other aspects of the extension's design lead me to consider its scale or massing are oppressive or dominant. The hipped roof form helps here. In any event, due to the property's position and the tight-knit grain of the area, the rear extension is not a feature within the street scene. Hence, it does not cause an unneighbourly visual impact.
7. Despite the extension introducing a brick façade at first-floor level running along the party boundary with No. 16, the first-floor bedrooms in No. 16 still have an outlook of the built form opposite (at a distance) and the rear gardens of the semi-detached pairing. The occupants of No. 16 also have a relatively open aspect afforded by the car park off Milton Court to the east which remains unchanged. As such, the proposal does not harm the outlook of the occupants of No. 16.
8. The appellants Daylight and Sunlight Report confirms that the proposal does not cause any undue loss of daylight or sunlight to the occupants of No 16.
9. In the round, having regard to the various matters considered, I do not share the Council's view that the proposal is overbearing to the occupants of No. 16.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal accords with Policies SP1, DM1 and EN1 of Core Strategy Development Plan Document and saved UDP Policy DC1. These jointly seek, among other things, development to be well designed, be of an appropriate layout, scale, form, massing, material and detail, have regard to the character of the surrounding area and make a positive contribution to the health and wellbeing of residents.

Conditions

11. In this case I have not imposed any conditions, notwithstanding those suggested by the Council, as the extension has been built as per the submitted plans.

Conclusion

12. The proposal accords with the Development Plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this.
13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR