
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by M Clowes BA (Hons) MCD PG CERT (Arch con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/25/3361163

33 Booth Avenue, Manchester M14 6RB

- 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 Mrs Jamie Louise Riley [Eon Core] against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application reference is 140073/FH/2024.
 - The development proposed is the installation of external wall insulation to the front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. In the banner heading above, I have used the description contained on the Council's decision notice as it more accurately describes the development. I observed on my site visit that the development has already commenced and appears to be completed. Planning permission is therefore sought retrospectively, and I have made my recommendation on that basis.
4. I viewed the appeal site from Booth Avenue but I was unable to access the rear of the dwelling. Based on all that I have seen and read, including the photographs supplied in the Council's officer report, I am satisfied that I have sufficient information to assess the impact of the external wall insulation (EWI) on the character and appearance of the area.
5. The appellant has suggested that the cladding of a dwellinghouse would be permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. It is not for me to determine the lawfulness of the development as part of this S78 appeal. The appellant applied for planning permission and it therefore falls to me to determine the appeal that is before me.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The appeal site comprises a 3-storey mid-terraced dwelling situated within a residential area. The street scene is characterised by traditional terraced dwellings which despite some minor variances in appearance, have a uniform character overall. They feature original architectural details including red brick elevations with decorative eaves detailing and windows with stone headers and sills. As a dwelling in the middle of the terrace, the appeal site has an important role to play in contributing to the consistent and uniform character of the area.
8. Even though the brickwork of the host dwelling was previously painted yellow before the EWI was installed, the pattern of the brickwork underneath, as well as the full extent of the stone sills and lintels were still evident. Conversely, due to its overall coverage, the EWI has obscured the brickwork of the dwelling including the stepped feature around the front door, the stone headers and sills to the front and the arched brick lintels to the rear, as well as disrupting and crowding the decorative brick banding under the eaves.
9. In addition, by virtue of the thickness of the EWI, it projects further to the front of the dwellings in the terrace, which emphasises its flat and featureless appearance. It also deepens the reveal of the windows creating a profile that is untypical of the terrace. Consequently, the EWI appears as a stark and incongruous addition along Booth Avenue which undermines the consistent appearance and materials of the terrace and the contribution it makes to the uniform character of the area. Although the rear of the dwelling is not visible in public views it would be visible in a number of private views from neighbouring dwellings.
10. The appellant states that Eon has secured planning approvals for numerous other similar proposals. These are not in the same area as the appeal site. Moreover, the evidence before me does not clearly demonstrate that the context of those examples is similar. For example, the extract from the report for 18 Park Street states that Park Street does not have a uniform material palette and that render has been established at a neighbouring property. The extract from the report for 3 Coniston Grove refers to the area having fully rendered/pebble-dashed dwellings. This is not the same as the context of the appeal site which has a consistent material palette with no other rendered dwellings. Consequently, these examples do not justify the development at the appeal site.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development is harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It conflicts with Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), Policies SP1, EN1 and DM1 of the Manchester City Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) and Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document for Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan (2024). Amongst other things, these policies require that developments have regard to the character of the area and surrounding street scene including in terms of design and materials.

Other Matters

12. The appellant suggests that Eon has a mandate to improve housing stock and that their Great British Insulation Scheme allows certain homeowners to improve home energy efficiencies through the implementation of energy efficient 'upgrades.' EWI does not appear to be one of the specified insulation options. Be that as it may,

sustainability objectives do not negate the need for development to comply with local planning policies. I acknowledge that the EWI may have energy saving benefits at the property, as well as wider sustainability benefits. However, there are no precise details of the overall extent of such benefits in the evidence presented, which relate to a single dwelling only. Accordingly, these benefits are of a limited extent and do not justify the harm of the development.

13. The appellant refers to the evolving technology and building materials of EWI and possible enhancements that could be deployed at the host dwelling, such as using an applied brick effect. However, I am not satisfied that a planning condition would be reasonable, given that it would result in a materially different appearance to the EWI that has been applied for and has not been the subject of public consultation. Neither am I satisfied that it would overcome the harm of the development due to the overall coverage and projection of the EWI and the resulting loss of the dwelling's traditional features.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. The development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and, on that basis, the appeal is dismissed.

M Clowes

INSPECTOR