



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2024

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/24/3345313

10 Dobroyd Street, Manchester, M8 5AD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ahmed against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 139159/FH/2024.
 - The development proposed is erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension, front and rear roof dormers and hip to gable alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of numbers 8 and 10 Dobroyd Street (numbers 8 and 10), with regard to outlook and natural light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling, which is situated in a densely built-up area of the city. House types along Dobroyd Street vary in terms of their age, scale, and appearance. Several of these have been altered and extended in various ways.
4. The proposal would add significantly to the size of, what is currently, a relatively small dwelling. It would provide additional bedroom and bathroom space at first and second floor levels with extended kitchen, "reception," wet room and study space on the ground floor.
5. The Council contends that the proposal would be overly bulky and visually obtrusive, due to its scale and design in relation to numbers 8 and 10. It considers that it would be out of character with the area. As such, the Council cites a conflict with Policies SP1, EN1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 (CS) and with Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 (UDP).
6. The above policies seek to ensure (amongst other things) that the design of new development is of high quality and that its scale and design has regard to the character of the surrounding area. Policy DC1 of the UDP also states that

residential extensions should not be excessively large or bulky and they should be subservient in relation to the existing dwelling.

7. Whilst I have noted the variety of dwelling types and sizes in the area around the appeal site, most properties are relatively modest in terms of their scale and appearance. In my opinion, the appeal proposal, when considered as a whole, would appear overly large and out of character with its surroundings.
8. The existing rear garden of the property is relatively small and the proposal would be an excessively dominant and visually intrusive feature that would fail to integrate with its surroundings. The partial closure of the gap between the side of the property and the side of number 10 would also be harmful to the appearance of the streetscene. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with the policies of the CS and the UDP, as referred to above.
9. The Council has also stated that the appellant has failed to provide details of the external materials to be used on the proposed front and rear dormers. I consider that the submission of these details could be the subject of a condition if the appeal was to be allowed. In itself, the Council's concern does not justify a refusal of planning permission.

Living Conditions

10. Policies DM1 and DC1, referred to above, also require new development and residential extensions to have regard to amenity. In this case, whilst I am not persuaded that there would be an unacceptable loss of natural light, I share the Council's concerns that the proposed rear extensions would have an unacceptably overbearing impact on both numbers 8 and 10.
11. I consider that the impact on number 8 would be greater, because number 10 has an existing single-storey rear extension, which affords some screening and protection. Nevertheless, the proposal's height, extent of projection (including both two storey and single storey elements) and its overall mass would be overbearing and would have an adverse effect on the outlook from both neighbouring dwellings and their gardens.
12. In reaching my decision, I have considered the appellant's argument that the first floor of the extensions would not project in front of a line drawn at 45 degrees from the neighbouring windows. Whilst this is often a useful guide in assessing proposals, it is only a guide and each case must be considered on its merits.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR