The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2023

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/23/3328092
255 Broadfield Road, Manchester M14 7JT

- 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 Mohammed Islam against the decision of Manchester City Council.
- The application Ref 137097/FH/2023, dated 29 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 25 July 2023.
- The development proposed is a rear dormer, hip to gable, extension to the rear kitchen in the ground floor and installation of roller shutter door to rear garage.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. This end terraced property originally had a hipped roof. The roof has already been altered with a hip to gable extension added forward of the original central ridge line. This has resulted in the loss of the ornate brickwork string below the original eaves. It has also been completed in brickwork which does not match the remaining side elevation. An almost full width box dormer has been added to replace the rear element of the roof which does retain the brickwork string and is set very marginally back beyond the side facing eaves. The eaves to the rear have been removed and the dormer sits flush with the rear wall below.

4. The new roof elements when taken together result in an entirely unacceptable composition which fails to have regard to the original character of this property. It represents particularly poor design. The form and dominance of the dormer is at odds with the original property design and that of the neighbouring properties. It appears as an overly dominant and incongruous addition. Whilst it has been suggested that the materials could be altered, this would not address these concerns.

5. An existing single storey rear extension has been replaced by a new rear extension. The side facing materials do not match those of the main side elevation and the roof is poorly finished. Because of the materials and

detailing, this similarly detracts from the appearance of the property and the street scene.

6. The works include a roller shutter garage door which is not a positive feature, given its general character and its high level protruding external shutter box. I understand however that this is a replacement and the council have not raised a concern with regard to this element of the proposal. I have not therefore considered this detail further.

7. Overall, the works have destroyed elements of the building that were important to its character. The alterations are out of keeping and result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. The development is therefore contrary to policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012) as the works are not of an appropriate form, mass, materials or detailing. Whilst saved policy DC1(1.1c) of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) offers support for enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs, this is outweighed by the conflicts with policy DC1(1.1d and 1.2c) as the works are out of character with the style of development in the area and the surrounding street scene by virtue of design, use of materials and construction details. Being of poor design, the development is also entirely at odds with the design aspirations of the National Planning Policy Framework.

8. Reference is made to the Council's 'Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance' and to Core Strategy policies SP1 and EN1. These do not add significantly to the detailed provisions of the policies referred to above in this particular regard.

9. The appellant suggests that the proposal, or elements of it, represent permitted development. The purpose of this appeal is not to consider lawfulness which can be assessed as part of an alternative procedure. As the application is before me, I have considered it on its merits. It is also suggested that although already in place, the materials could be controlled by condition. Whilst the use of more appropriate materials in all elements of the works would be beneficial, this would not overcome my concerns, particularly with regard to the rear dormer. Whilst reference has been made to other dormers in the area, I did not find these to be directly comparable.

10. The works have provided additional accommodation for the appellant without harm to neighbouring amenity. I have also had regard to the other matters put forward by the appellant. Whilst there are matters that offer some weight in favour of the development, they are not sufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR