



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2022

by L Hughes, BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/22/3299798

17 Thurleigh Road, Didsbury, Manchester M20 2DF

- 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 Tom Harrington against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 132608/FH/2021, dated 27 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a new gable end loft conversion and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new gable end loft conversion and rear dormer at 17 Thurleigh Road, Didsbury, M20 2DF, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 132608/FH/2021, dated 27 December 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawing 'Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations 2267_DIDF_01_Planning_Rev_A'.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a traditional 2 storey brick and render semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof, which reflects the main character of Thurleigh Road and the adjacent streets. The dwelling includes a hipped roof 2 storey side extension, comparable to those on numerous of the other similar dwellings. These additions to the dwellings appear subservient to their hosts, predominantly because their roof ridges are set down from the ridges of the original dwellings.

4. The appeal proposal is for a part hip to gable roof extension along with a rear dormer. While changing the original roof to a gable would create an alternate roof form compared to the existing matching hipped roofs, and more substantial massing including as a result of the new rear dormer, the existing extension would still remain set down from the ridge. The dwelling overall would also still retain a part hipped roof due to the existing extension. The main character of the original property and the subservience of the existing extension would therefore still be retained. The difference in the roof forms would not be main feature of the property or draw significant attention compared to the whole. It is a relatively large dwelling, and thus as a whole it would still be in proportion, and would also not unduly unbalance the conjoined pair.
5. Therefore, while the overriding character of the streetscene is predominantly hipped roofs, the insertion of this gable would not cause harm within its wider context. On my site visit I also assessed the wider character of the area and viewed nearby properties highlighted by the appellant with gable end conversions, as well as other examples. While they inevitably differ to some extent in specific context, I found that they did not have an overriding negative or intrusive impact on the character of the streetscene or area taken as a whole.
6. In conclusion therefore, the development would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene. Accordingly, I find no conflict with saved Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012), and guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These policies seek, amongst other things, that development should have regard to the character of the property, the surrounding area, and the overall appearance in the streetscene, through the impact in terms of design, scale, and appearance, including a need to retain subservience.

Other Matters

7. The Council raised no concern relating to impact on living conditions relating to privacy resulting from overlooking. I note the objection from No.1 Anerly Road in this regard, and thus my site visit included taking note of views from the host dwelling's existing first floor windows. However, I find that while the rear dormer would create an increased level of overlooking, it would not be significant or in close proximity. In addition, the garden of No.1 is already overlooked to some extent from No. 17 as well as other dwellings at closer range and at differing angles of view.
8. I also note the neighbour concerns about a potential increase in noise resulting from further bi-fold doors, but the use of such doors is common in domestic dwellings, and therefore I expect that any noise would be at reasonable levels for this residential location.

Conditions

9. I have attached the standard conditions which limit the lifespan of the planning permission, and specify the approved plan for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

10. As there is no materials key within the submitted drawing, in the interests of certainty I have also imposed a condition requiring the materials to match those of the existing dwelling, in order to preserve the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude the development would accord with the development plan taken as a whole, and therefore that the appeal should be allowed.

L Hughes

INSPECTOR