



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: 5th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/22/3306309

14 Delacourt Road, Manchester M14 6BX

- 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 Parveen Kauser against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 133779/FH/2022, dated 03 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as erection of a double storey side extension to form additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a double storey side extension to form additional living accommodation, at 14 Delacourt Road, Manchester M14 6BX, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 133779/FH/2022, dated 03 May 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 01 (Existing), 02 (Proposed Plans), 04 (Existing and Proposed Elevations) and 13 (Proposed Site Plan).
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. I observed during my site visit that the development has started, with construction of the external elevations at ground-floor level having been completed. I have made my Decision taking this into account, though the Decision is based on the submitted plans.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the original property, the street scene and the character and appearance of the area, and
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of the existing neighbouring property number 12 Delacourt Road.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling which has previously been extended with a part two-storey/part single-storey extension across the rear. There are 2 domestic outbuildings in the rear garden.
5. The site is located within a residential area characterised by two-storey, semi-detached dwellings laid out in a traditional grid style. I consider the original gaps between each of the pairs of semi-detached dwellings contribute to defining the semi-detached character of the area. Nevertheless, I acknowledge that several surrounding properties have constructed two-storey side extensions. As these vary in terms of their detail of siting, depth, width, height and proximity to the boundary with neighbouring properties, the character and appearance of the area has been retained.
6. The proposed two-storey side extension is set-in a little from the shared boundary with No. 12. The first floor would be set-back around 1 m from the existing front elevation. The roof ridge would be set below the existing main roof ridge, and it would be hipped. I note that No. 12 has an extant planning permission for a two-storey side extension. However, at the time of my visit this planning permission had not been implemented. Therefore, the gap between No. 12 and the shared boundary currently remains.
7. Thus, the proposal as described and the resultant relationship with No. 12 as it would be without No. 12 implementing the extant planning permission, to my mind would be very similar to the design, size, and siting of the two-storey side extensions I observed at No. 10 Delacourt Road and its relationship with No. 8 and at No. 54 Delacourt Road and its relationship with No. 52. I acknowledge that the first-floor set-back proposed may not be as deep as the first-floor set-backs on Nos 10 and 54. Nevertheless, I consider the overall effect would be very similar.
8. For the reasons outlined, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the original dwelling and would not create or potentially create a terracing effect in the street scene. As such, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area.
9. I have noted that the planning permission at No. 12 is extant. I have therefore considered what effect the proposal would have should the extant planning permission at No. 12 be implemented. If this were to happen, the overall effect would be similar to what I observed at Nos 39 and 41 Brentbridge Road (not far from the site), ie primarily that a small gap would remain between the respective extensions along the shared boundary. In fact, I consider the resultant relationship between Nos 14 and 12 (should the extant permission at No. 12 be implemented) would have less of a potential to create a terracing effect than Nos 39 and 41 Brentbridge Road. This is because the respective proposed/approved extensions at Nos 14 and 12 are not identical, in contrast with Nos 39 and 41 Brentbridge Road, where the extensions mirror each other.
10. I acknowledge that Saved Policy DC1.4 of The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995, (UDP), seeks to ensure that narrow gaps between two-storey extensions adjacent to each other are avoided. Although the resultant gap, should No. 12 implement the extant planning permission, would

be narrow, I consider the key aim of policies DC1.1 to DC1.4 of protecting the character and appearance of residential areas, would be achieved.

11. I therefore conclude that the development would accord with Saved Policy DC1 of the UDP, Policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012, (CS), and design policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), with regard to design and protecting the distinct character and appearance of areas.

Living conditions - existing

12. The appeal property and the neighbouring property No. 12 are oriented in broadly a south-westerly to north-easterly direction, front to rear. The existing gap between the 2 respective side elevations is around 4.5 m. There are no windows serving habitable rooms on the side elevation of No. 12 (nor would there be any on the side elevation of the development at the appeal site). Like the appeal property, No. 12 has a rear garden, which is its main private outdoor space.
13. Within the circumstances described, I conclude that the proposed two-storey side extension would not have any significant detrimental effects on the living conditions of occupiers of the existing property No. 12, in respect of overshadowing, overbearing or light levels.
14. Furthermore, should the extant planning permission at No. 12 be implemented, even the limited effects the proposal would have on No. 12 in respect of the matters referred to would be removed.
15. I therefore conclude that the development at the appeal site would accord with Saved Policies DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.3, DC1.4 of UDP and DM1 of the CS which collectively, and among other things, seek to protect the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conditions

16. I have taken account of the conditions suggested by the Council, should the appeal be allowed. I have not attached a condition requiring the development to begin within a specified period, since development has begun. Conditions are attached requiring development to be completed in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt, and for external materials to match existing, to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons outlined, I conclude that the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions outlined above.

J Williamson

INSPECTOR