



23rd January 2025

Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2024

by Martin H Seddon BSc DipTP MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/24/3353767

211 Peel Hall Road, Wythenshawe, Manchester M22 5HJ

- 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 Andy Flynn against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 140599/FH/2024.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two storey side and part two/part single storey rear extension with rear roof dormers, together with outbuilding in rear garden for ancillary living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Number 211 Peel Hall Road is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a garage and located in a residential area which includes semi-detached and detached dwellings of a similar form and age. The neighbouring dwelling at 213 Peel Hall Road has a single storey side extension to its boundary with the appeal building.
4. The proposed two storey side extension would have an almost continuous ridge line with that of the existing dwelling, a part hipped roof and a similar set-back at the front elevation to that of the existing garage.
5. The general layout of semi-detached properties in Peel Hall Road includes single storey side extensions or garages, which provides a sense of spaciousness between neighbouring pairs of semi-detached houses. The scale of the proposed two storey side extension, its minimal set down from the house ridgeline, roof form and small setback from the front elevation would result in an excessively large extension with potential for creating a terracing effect with the neighbouring dwelling. The sense of spaciousness between the appeal building and 213 would also be significantly reduced when compared to other buildings in the area.
6. The Council considers that the proposed outbuilding would be acceptable due to its ground floor nature, with the maximum eaves height being around 860mm above permitted development restrictions. The structure would be large at around

9 metres in length and 4.5 metres in width and would have a toilet and sink. The Council has suggested that if the building was allowed it should be subject to a condition preventing its use as a dwelling or for short term letting. Nevertheless, the outbuilding would add to the over-development of the site because of its size and scale.

7. I find that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area. It would conflict with Manchester Core Strategy (MCS) policy SP1 which seeks to create well designed places that enhance or create character, MCS policy DM1 regarding the siting of development, its layout, scale form and massing, and MCS policy EN1 concerning the Wider Wythenshawe Character Area. It would also fail to comply with policy C1 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan which indicates that extensions should not be excessively large or bulky and that the potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a terracing effect.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has referred to other extensions to dwellings in Peel Hall Road and in its vicinity. However, I have no detailed information as to how these came about. I have determined this appeal based upon the individual merits of the proposal and its particular site circumstances having regard to relevant development plan and national planning policies.

Conclusion

9. There are no other considerations sufficient to outweigh my findings that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area and the conflict with the development plan as a whole.
10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR