
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2022

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/22/3297104
38 Greenford Road, Manchester, M8 0NW

- 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 Parvez Akhtar against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 132864/FH/2022, dated 4 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is extension and alteration and front and rear dormer windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on i) the character and appearance of the area and ii) the living conditions of occupiers of adjacent dwellings.

Reasons

3. 38 Greenford Road comprises a detached red brick bungalow with a large and unsympathetic, timber clad, box dormer on its south facing elevation. It is situated on a prominent corner plot bound by low level fencing to the front and side. The whole curtilage of the dwelling is block paved with the exception of a narrow border.
4. It is proposed to remove the whole of the roof, including the dormer, and to demolish two of the external walls. The footprint of the dwelling would be extended to the south and west, the eaves height would be increased and a new pitched roof would be constructed containing six pitched roof dormer windows and a roof light. The proposal would, in effect, create a new dwelling, with only part of the northern and eastern elevations being original.

Character and appearance

5. The site is located in a residential estate location comprising a mixture of houses and bungalows, which are set back from the highway and have regular spaces between buildings and boundaries. Other bungalows surrounding the site have been altered and extended over the years and consequently flat roof dormers, of varying size, are now a common feature in the area.

6. It is proposed to increase the eaves height of the appeal property by approximately 0.6m. The ridge height would increase by approximately 1.2m. It is also proposed to add multiple pitched roof dormers. The proposed dormers would be smaller in scale and better proportioned than the existing large flat roof dormer. Although pitched roof dormers are not characteristic of the area, given the detached nature of the property and its position on a corner plot, the dormers would not harmfully detract from the character and appearance of the area. The increased eaves and ridge height would however appear incongruous in a street scene where all other adjacent bungalows and dormer bungalows are of the same height.
7. On drawing sheet 6 of the submitted plans, the existing front door and adjacent window in the gable elevation are shown retained. However, the proposed floor plans on drawing sheet 4 show that the existing gable elevation window would be blocked up, leaving just a very small window or glazed panel to the side of the door. The result of this would be a substantial expanse of brickwork with minimal detailing or fenestration, which is not appropriate on such a prominent front facing elevation.
8. Although the south east facing elevation, which would become the new front elevation, would be more balanced and well-proportioned than it is at present, the eaves would be raised well above the top of the windows and doors and no detailing has been added. The building would extend closer to the road but would retain a sufficient area of open space to the front and side. The extension up to the western side boundary would however detract from the street scene where space between buildings and boundaries is a prominent and positive feature.
9. Overall, the proposal is of poor design and detail and as a result would be contrary to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (the Core Strategy) and saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (the UDP), which seek amongst other things to ensure that all new development is appropriate in terms of siting, layout, scale, form, detail, design and appearance having regard to the surrounding area.

Living Conditions

10. At the time of my visit I could see that No. 36 Greenford Road was unoccupied and was undergoing renovation. The side elevation contains a ground floor kitchen window and a first floor window, which is not obscure glazed and possibly serves a bedroom.
11. Privacy between ground floor windows can usually be protected by appropriate boundary treatment. However, in this case, the plans before me suggest the side elevation of the appeal property is on the boundary line. Accordingly there is no space to provide any privacy screening. Moreover, a fence would not prevent overlooking from any first floor windows. Currently there are no first floor windows and the proposal would introduce these, increasing the level of overlooking beyond that which currently exists. The increased height of the dwelling would also appear more oppressive and due to its position to the south of No. 36 would increase the level of over shadowing.
12. The proposed kitchen window, which I acknowledge is an existing window, would be retained in the north elevation of the appeal property facing the driveway and kitchen window of No. 36 Greenford Road. This could easily be

relocated to the front, east facing, gable end, which would provide an open outlook with more natural light as well as improving the privacy for residents of both 36 and 38 Greenford Road.

13. Extending the footprint of the bungalow right up to the western boundary of the site would leave no access to the rear garden other than through the house. Moreover, Nos. 2 and 4 Rainham Drive have small rear gardens and the extension, due to the combination of its increased height and its close proximity to the rear of these properties would appear visually obtrusive.
14. I therefore conclude that the increased height, the addition of dormer windows to the northern elevation and the proximity of the extended dwelling to the boundaries of adjacent dwellings to the north and south-west would be contrary to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved policy DC1 of the UDP, which seek amongst other things to ensure that all new development has regard to residential amenity including privacy, outlook and light.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR