



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: 04.10.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/23/3326112

31 Clitheroe Road, Manchester M13 0GE

- 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 Asim Javed against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application 134604/FH/2022, dated 4 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension to form additional living space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed two-storey extension on the character and appearance of the streetscene; and on the living conditions of the neighbours at No.29 Clitheroe Road.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. No.31 Clitheroe Road (No.31) is a traditional mid-terrace house with an original two-storey outrigger to the rear. The terrace has a street frontage to Clitheroe Road but Weaverham Close gives access to the rear, with the terrace set back from the road behind small yards and some off street car parking. I observed on my site visit that whilst some houses have painted brick, there is a cohesive character and appearance to the rear elevation of Clitheroe Road; the original form, building line and pattern of outriggers within the terrace has generally been retained.
4. It is proposed to construct a two-storey extension which would project around 2.1m from the existing outrigger of No.31, accommodating a larger kitchen at ground and a larger bedroom at first floor. In combination with the original outrigger, the proposed extension would project around 5.4m from the principal rear elevation of the house, with a limited offset from the rear boundary. The two-storey extension would be the same width as the existing outrigger and would have a similar profile to the existing gable, save the chimney stack would be set back. Notwithstanding this, and the proposed brick construction, by extending over two-storeys for almost the full length of the yard, the proposed extension would sit well forward of the original rear building

line and would be unduly prominent within the streetscene of Weaverham Close, to the detriment of its cohesive character and appearance.

5. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of rear extensions to neighbouring houses at No.23 and No.27 Clitheroe Road. I saw on site that the original outrigger of No.27 has been extended only at ground floor with a shallow pitched roof. In that it is only single storey, it is clearly markedly different to the appeal proposal before me. I also note from the Council's Delegated Report that the advice given to the appellant's agent during the course of the planning application was that a single storey rear extension with the proposed rearward projection could be considered as acceptable in this location. I acknowledge that the outrigger of No.23 has been extended over two-storeys up to the original rear boundary of the property. However, I am mindful that planning permission was granted for this extension in 1976, so assessed against the policies of a different development plan. I also observed that this historic extension does not make a particularly positive contribution to the character and appearance of the streetscene and it duly lends no support to the proposal now before me.
6. I therefore find on the first main issue that the proposed extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene. Consequently, in addition to a conflict with the principles of good design in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) it would conflict with policies SP1, DM1 and EN1 of Manchester's Core Strategy, Development Plan Document (2012) (CS) which together require development to be of good design, create well designed places that enhance character and are appropriate in their layout, scale and form. It would further conflict with saved Policy DC1 of The Manchester Plan, Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) (UDP) which requires extensions to residential properties to have regard to the general character of the property and the overall appearance of the proposal in the streetscene.

Living conditions

7. The neighbour at No.29 Clitheroe Road (No.29), on the eastern side of the appeal property, appears to have a habitable room window alongside that of No.31's first floor rear bedroom window, set back behind the outrigger on the principal rear elevation of the house. The proposed two-storey extension would project around 2.1m from the existing outrigger, and in combination with it, would project some 5.4m from this principal elevation.
8. I acknowledge that the outlook from the first floor window of No.29 is already restricted by its own outrigger and the existing two-storey outrigger of No.31. However, extending this outrigger further (almost the full length of the yard) would create a noticeable tunnel effect, appearing overbearing from this window. Because of the orientation, proximity and depth of the existing outrigger of No.31, I am not persuaded that the proposed extension would result in overshadowing to the rear habitable rooms of No.29 over the existing situation. Nor do I have any evidence before me that this would be the case.
9. Notwithstanding my conclusion regarding overshadowing, I conclude that the loss of outlook to the first floor window of No.29 would cause significant harm to the living conditions of its occupiers. Consequently, the proposed two-storey extension would conflict with CS policies SP1, DM1 and EN1 and saved UDP Policy DC1 which, amongst other things, require developments, including

extensions, to be of good design, have regard to the effects on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and make a positive contribution to the wellbeing of residents. It would further conflict with the guidance at paragraph 130 of the Framework that development should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing users.

Other Matters

10. I have taken in to consideration the appellant's need to provide additional accommodation for family members, notably a larger third bedroom. However, whilst this is clearly a private benefit of the proposals, in this case, it is not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have found to the character and appearance of the streetscene, or to the living conditions of neighbours. I also have no compelling evidence before me that the proposal is the only means of accommodating those needs at the property.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Jones

INSPECTOR