



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2023

by J Williamson BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/22/3305886

16 Clarendon Road West, Manchester M21 0RW

- 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 Michael Hewson against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 134020/FH/2022, dated 9 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

- 1) The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

- 2) The main issue is the effect of the proposed development the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

- 3) The property to which the proposal relates is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling of traditional Victorian design. The property has a two-storey outrigger that has a roof ridge height a little lower than the main roof ridge height that runs east-west. I consider the roof ridge height of the outrigger contributes to it having the appearance of being subservient to the main body of the dwelling.
- 4) The site is located within a dense urban residential area laid out in a traditional grid pattern. The dwellings surrounding the site are predominantly two-storey, semi-detached. The appeal property is sited near the centre of a row of around 9 semi-detached dwellings with a consistent design, located on the southern side of Clarendon Road West.
- 5) I appreciate that several of the dwellings along Clarendon Road West, close to the appeal site, have converted the loft/roof space into habitable accommodation. Some of these dormer extensions are smaller than the appeal proposal and evidently subservient to the original dwellings. Nevertheless, there are a few that are very similar to the appeal proposal in respect of siting, design, scale and mass. However, I consider there is one aspect of the proposed extension which is significantly different to the design of other dormers close to the site.
- 6) Thus, the roof height of the proposed dormer would be higher than the existing roof ridge height of the two-storey outriggers of the adjoining semi-detached properties, ie numbers 16 and 14 Clarendon Road West. Consequently, the proposal would erode the existing symmetry of the adjoining outriggers. As the

symmetry is repeated along the row of semi-detached dwellings to which No. 16 forms a part, the proposal would disrupt the symmetry between the collection of semi-detached dwellings that currently exists.

- 7) The proposal would be visible from several public vantage points, for example the northern end of Buckingham Road and several points on Bryan Road, to the rear of the site, as well as many of the properties, and their rear gardens, on Bryan Road. The proposed extension would give the appearance of the appeal dwelling being higher than neighbouring properties, disrupting the existing harmony, consistency and symmetry between them. The two-storey outrigger on the appeal dwelling would also cease to be subservient to the main body of the property.
- 8) For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
- 9) The appellant has drawn my attention to an extension the Council approved in 2017, Ref 117786/FH/2017. I acknowledge that there are many similarities between the dwelling to which the permission relates, the context of the site, the approved extension and the appeal before me. The policies of the development plan are also the same now as they were in 2017.
- 10) However, since application Ref 117786/FH/2017 was determined, there has been a marked change in national planning policy and guidance regarding high quality design and its importance in maintaining a sense of place (among other things). To my mind, the case referred to by the appellant illustrates the concerns I have expressed above regarding the proposal before me. Consequently, it should not be used to justify similar proposals.
- 11) The appellant has also drawn my attention to appeal Decision Ref APP/B4215/C/17/3171637, where an Inspector colleague allowed a series of extensions to a dwelling. I do not have the full details of the case before me, but from the information provided and a visit to the site/area during my site visit for the appeal before me, I consider the design of the dwelling to which the appeal relates, the context of the area and the development allowed, are all significantly different to the case before me. As such, I consider the 2 cases are not directly comparable.
- 12) In light of all the above, the proposal would not accord with policies SP1, EN1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document, 2012, or saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (which, with regard to protecting the character of the area, is broadly consistent with design policies in the National Planning Policy Framework). Collectively, and among other things, these policies seek to protect the character and appearance of local areas, having regard to design, siting, form and scale.

Conclusion

- 13) For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

J Williamson

INSPECTOR