
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 March 2025

by **H Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/24/3354581

2 Longford Place, Manchester M14 5QR

- 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 Muhammad Waqas Nazam against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 140638/FH/2024.
 - The development proposed is double storey side extension, single storey rear extension, loft conversion and internal alterations to an existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the planning application process, amended plans were requested and received by the Council which were used to determine the application. I have similarly determined the appeal on the basis of these amended plans.
3. The Council has no objections to the single storey rear extension and the loft conversion. I have no reason to disagree with the Council in this respect. My report therefore concentrates on the matter in dispute between the parties, namely the double storey side extension.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The host dwelling is a semi-detached property, set back from the highway in a predominantly residential area. The area is characterised by a mix of dwelling types with semi-detached dwellings to the side and terraced properties opposite. The regular spacing between the semi-detached dwellings gives a regular rhythm and uniform appearance to the street scene. Adjacent to the property is the Victoria Park Christian Fellowship building which sits at the corner of Longford Place and Daisy Bank Road.
6. The plot is an irregular space being narrower to the front, and wider to the rear. The amended plans show the proposed two storey extension would be the same width throughout its length. It would extend the full width of the site at the front of the property, and it would be set back from the front elevation.

7. The neighbouring church building is taller than the host dwelling and set back from the shared boundary. The extension would be closer to the church building and although a small gap would remain, it would substantially diminish the space between the buildings reducing the appearance of spaciousness between them. This would be exacerbated by the two-storey nature of the extension. The spaces between buildings are an important characteristic of the area and the proposed extension would therefore be an intrusive and dominant feature in the area.
8. For the above reasons the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies SP 1, DM 1 and EN 1 of the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 and Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan which together and amongst other matters seek to ensure that development has regard to the character of the surrounding area with particular regard to its scale and appearance and protects and enhances the built environment.

Other Matter

9. I note the appellant's concerns regarding the Council's handling of the case. However, this is a matter that would need to be taken up with the Council in the first instance. In determining this appeal, I am only able to have regard to the planning merits of the appeal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Senior

INSPECTOR