



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 July 2025

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/25/3365367

33 Cedric Road, Manchester M8 4JE

- 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 Wachstock against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 141385/FH/2024.
 - The development proposed is described as 'two-storey side extension'.
-

Preliminary Matter

1. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, the Council described the proposal as the 'erection of part single, part two storey side extension to form additional living accommodation'. As this more comprehensively describes the proposed development, it has been used in this Decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of part single, part two storey side extension to form additional living accommodation at 33 Cedric Road, Manchester M8 4JE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 141385/FH/2024, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, GSS24097 003 Rev 5 and GSS24097 502.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a corner house at the junction of Cedric Road and Huntley Road. Whilst precedent has been referred to by both main parties, there are no other properties in the locality which have a similar spatial arrangement in respect

of proximity to other houses and to the adjacent roads. Accordingly, the proposal has been determined on its own merits.

5. The proposed part two-storey, part single-storey side extension would not extend as far as the side boundary, being set in by around 2m. This would maintain space around the building at the junction and would comply with the distance requirement of the design guidance set out in UDP Policy DC1.4.
6. The design of the extension would respect that of the host property and its overall size would be proportionate. The extension would project beyond the front building line of the neighbouring Huntley Road. However, I have considered the gradually curving layout of the houses in Huntley Road, the space that would remain at the side of the appeal property and the overall spaciousness of the plot. Within this context I find that the extension would not have an overly dominant, visually obtrusive or jarring appearance. It would sit comfortably within the wide plot and would not appear out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area. Whilst the extension would feature in views along the two streets, this would not be to the detriment of visual amenity.
7. Thus, the proposal would comply with UDP Policy DC1.4 and Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy which, among other things, require development to have regard to its setting, including through aspects such as its siting, scale, form and massing. There would be no conflict with the similar design requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

9. It is reasonable and necessary to impose a condition requiring the use of matching external materials to safeguard the appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. I have specified the approved drawings for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning. The Council suggested a condition requiring obscured glazing in the side elevation to prevent overlooking. However, the proposal does not include additional windows in the flank elevation. The suggested condition is therefore unnecessary and has not been imposed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR