



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2022 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by J Hunter BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/21/3288760

449 Wilbraham Road, Manchester, M21 0UZ

- 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 Mrs Noreen Aslam against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 131042/FH/2021, dated 12 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is raising ridge height and loft extension with rear dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Applications for costs

3. An application for costs was made by Mrs Noreen Aslam against Manchester City Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The host dwelling is a previously extended detached dwelling in a residential area characterised by detached dwellings. Properties are generally set back from the main road which gives a spacious and open character to the area with a regular rhythm of dwellings. Although several of the properties have been previously extended, they predominantly retain a hipped roof pattern and are of a similar height. 449 Wilbraham Road is located almost opposite the junction with Morville Road which allows longer range views of the property.
6. The appeal proposal would increase the bulk and massing of the roof, including increasing the steepness of the pitches roof to all elevations. The resultant roof, including the crown element would be a bulky and dominant feature which would not reflect the design of the host property. It would be a prominent

feature in the streetscene and would harmfully erode the spaciousness of the locality.

7. The raising of the roof height and change to the roof pitch would unbalance the property with the roof becoming a dominant, bulky feature which would not reflect the character or appearance of the host property. As a consequence, the contribution that the extended dwelling would make to the character and appearance of the area would be eroded.
8. My attention has been drawn to examples of dwellings in the local area with a crown roof. I am unconvinced that these developments are directly comparable to the proposal before me, given that from my observations, they did not appear to have altered the roof pitch or height. In addition, I am not aware of the circumstances that led to their approval including the relevant development plan policies in place at the time. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its own merits based on the site-specific circumstances of the case.
9. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area and would conflict with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and policies DC1.1 and DC1.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester which together, amongst other things seeks to ensure that development has regard to the appearance in the street scene and is not excessively bulky and out of character with development in the area

Other Matters

10. I note the appellant's concerns regarding the Council's handling of the planning application. However, this is a matter that would need to be taken up with the Council in the first instance. In determining this appeal, I am only able to have regard to the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

J Hunter

INSPECTOR