



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2023

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/23/3325140

The Coach House, 58 Central Road, Didsbury M20 4ZA

- 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 Ryan Lewis against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 136924/FH/2023, dated 9 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension to provide additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey extension to provide additional living accommodation at The Coach House, 58 Central Road, Didsbury M20 4ZA in accordance with the terms of the application, 136924/FH/2023, dated 9 May 2023, 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 following approved plans: Existing and Proposed Site Plan – dwg ref. SHA35A/01; Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – dwg ref. SHA35A/02; and Proposed Floor Plan and Elevations – dwg ref. SHA35A/03
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) Before first occupation the first floor windows in the east side elevation shall be obscure glazed to a specification of no less than level 5 of the Pilkington Glass Scale or such other alternative equivalent and shall remain so in perpetuity.
 - 5) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) Order 2015, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional glazing, windows, or doors, other than those shown on the approved plans, shall be inserted at the property unless Planning Permission is specifically granted.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposal on: the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area; and on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 58, 60 and 62 Central Road, with regards outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The Coach House is a two-storey detached dwelling located at the head of a cul-de-sac to the south of Central Road. It has a simple linear form, constructed in brick with a pitched slate roof.
4. The Coach House sits on a relatively constrained plot, with a small garden to the side enclosed by a close boarded timber fence on the frontage. It is proposed to extend into this garden area over two-storeys projecting around 4.5m from the existing east or flank elevation of The Coach House. The proposed extension would be offset from the front elevation of The Coach House by around 0.33m and although the angle of the proposed roof pitch would reflect the existing, its ridge has been lowered. The proposed extension would be built of brick with a slate roof to closely match its host, without fenestration on the front elevation. Because of the scale, simple design and choice of materials the extension would appear a sympathetic and modest addition to The Coach House, subservient to the original dwelling. In this regard, the proposal now before me differs markedly from the scheme considered by the previous Inspector in 2021 (APP/B4215/D/21/3273093).
5. The proposed extension would fill much of the space to the side of The Coach House, leaving a small garden area. It is acknowledged that the space around the resultant dwelling would be limited but I am satisfied that the space to the front of The Coach House (used for parking), the spacing between neighbouring properties and the landscaping on the rear boundary of the appeal site with the School means that the massing of the extension would sit comfortably in its wider context.
6. I observed on my site visit that the immediate locality of the appeal site is varied in its character and appearance. The Coach House is visible from Central Road seen between the rendered extension (with roof terrace) of No.58 Central Road (No.58) and a 1960s/70s three storey apartment block. The proposed extension would be apparent from the wide entrance of the cul-de-sac but for the reasons already given it would appear a modest addition and not visually obtrusive or unduly prominent. When approaching from the north-west, the proposed extension would appear as a set-back, subservient addition, to the front elevation of The Coach House. From the south-east and Hague Road opposite, the proposed extension would be largely hidden by the extension to No.58. The scale of the extension would not therefore overwhelm the local streetscape, rather it would assimilate well within it.
7. Taking the above into consideration, on the first main issue, I conclude that the proposed extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. It would therefore accord with saved Policy DC1 of The Manchester Plan, The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) (UDP) and policies SP1 and DM1 of Manchester's Local

Development Framework, Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) (CS). Together these policies seek to create well-designed places, that are appropriate in scale, massing and materials and have regard to the character of the surrounding area. It would also accord with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to achieve good design.

Living conditions

8. The existing boundary fence of The Coach House is set around 8.5m from the rear elevation of No.58 Central Road (No.58) which has windows facing the appeal site. Although the proposed extension would be higher than the fence, and clearly visible from No.58, it has been set back behind this existing fence line and behind the front elevation of The Coach House and the eaves of the pitched roof lowered. The principal outlook from the rear windows of No.58 would remain over the parking area between the two dwellings.
9. No.60 and 62 Central Road are sited at an oblique angle to The Coach House and whilst the proposed extension would project closer to the rear of the gardens of these dwellings, their outlook would remain largely open, over their own gardens and the school playing fields beyond. Because of the reasonable separation distance and modest scale and massing of the proposed extension, I do not find that it would not lead to a sense of enclosure such that it would cause harm to the living conditions of neighbours at No.58, 60 or 62 Central Road.
10. Due to the scale and orientation, the proposed extension would only reduce sunlight to the rear and parking area of No.58 for a short period of the day compared to the existing situation. The Council's own Delegated Report concludes that the proposal would have a minimal effect on local light. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of light to the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling.
11. Consequently, the proposed development would not significantly adversely affect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in terms of outlook and light. Thus, it would not conflict with saved UDP Policy DC1 or CS policies SP1 and DM1 insofar as they require that developments have regard to the effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and to not create an undue loss of sunlight or daylight. Further, it would not conflict with paragraph 130 of the Framework which requires development to create places that achieve a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard condition for implementation of the planning permission, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved drawings in the interests of certainty. To ensure a satisfactory appearance I have also imposed a condition requiring that the materials used match the existing dwelling.
13. The Council have suggested a condition which would require the windows in the east side elevation to be obscure glazed. Because of the proximity of the east elevation to the rear garden of No.60 Central Road, I find it necessary to impose such a condition but only in respect of the first floor windows. There would be no overlooking, or perceived overlooking, from the ground floor windows because of the existing boundary fence. I have amended the wording of the condition accordingly. Given the constrained nature of the site, I also

find it necessary, as suggested by the Council, to remove permitted development rights afforded to additional glazing, windows and doors.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR