



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2025

by **J Smith MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/W/25/3371976

393 Dickenson Road, Manchester M13 0WG

- 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 Rana against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 142155/FO/2025.
 - The development proposed is external alterations to façade.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. It has been declared that the works have started, but not yet completed. During my site visit, it was noted that the elements of large glazing were in situ and appeared to conform with the proposed plans. However, a key difference between the proposed plans and what was noted on site was the provision of metallic gold shrouding which covered the brickwork pillars to the edges of the building and its surrounding glazing. For the avoidance of doubt, I have assessed the appeal on the plans submitted at the application stage.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located within the Longsight District Centre, situated on Dickenson Road adjacent to Longsight Market. It forms part of a larger corner terrace that continues around onto Stockport Road. As this is a part-retrospective appeal, I was unable to assess the original appearance of the building during my site visit. However, photographic evidence of the building's previous appearance has been submitted and is included in the evidence before me.
5. The building previously featured a traditional shopfront design. Its principal elevation comprised large ground-floor windows with a central entrance and three evenly spaced first-floor windows. The roof incorporated a steep gable with traditional detailing along the eaves. These ornate roof details would be retained. In the surrounding area, neighbouring properties do take up contemporary forms with modern shop fronts. These do include large, glazed elements at a ground floor level. In this context, the appeal property is distinctively different and unique in an area of otherwise typical, modern buildings which make up this district centre and its commercial offer. The appeal site and the adjoining terraced corner row

provides a reflection of traditional buildings, in amongst more contemporary buildings.

6. However, this appearance had become obscured by substantial visual clutter, including window advertisements, a retractable canopy, air conditioning units, boarded upper-floor windows, and satellite dishes. As such, the pre-works external appearance of the appeal building was compromised by this visual clutter. Nevertheless, the traditional shopfront design is recognised from the evidence before me, despite the proliferation of external clutter.
7. While only guidance, the Manchester City Council Shopfront and Signage Design Guide suggests how shopfronts should reflect and respond positively to the architectural expression of the existing building. It further notes that where there is evidence of a historic shopfront, its reinstatement with a traditional design will be encouraged, with modern designs will generally only be supported where there is no evidence of the original shopfront and where a new design can be successfully integrated into the historical façade. This should be done through its integration with its architectural form, design, proportions, materials, craftsmanship and detailing.
8. The proposed plans indicate that key architectural features, including the roof detailing, brickwork pillars, and stonework, would be retained. However, the introduction of expansive glazed windows across both the ground and first floors results in the complete replacement of the traditional shopfront elevation. This new design fails to respect the architectural detailing and character of its traditional external appearance. The extensive use of glazing has erased the traditional shopfront aesthetic that was present prior to the development. Consequently, the external alterations give rise to a visually intrusive and incongruous design that undermines the building's traditional appearance.
9. I acknowledge that the immediate context is predominantly commercial in nature, with several properties along Dickenson Road and Stockport Road featuring large glazed frontages. However, these examples are situated within comparatively modern buildings whose architectural context differs from the traditional character of the appeal property.
10. I am also mindful that prior to the external works, the appearance of the appeal building was obscured by various elements of visual clutter. These items concealed much of the traditional detailing of its shopfront. However, based on the evidence available, this clutter consisted of removable items which, if cleared, would have allowed the original architectural character of the shopfront to be appreciated. While the building was in a visually poor condition, this does not justify the removal of its traditional architectural features, which contribute to its character.
11. The appellant has submitted, as part of the appeal, contextual information regarding the business, its design ethos, and customer feedback. It is asserted that the proposed shopfront reflects the design of recently established outlets, thereby promoting visual consistency across the brand. However, this rationale does not justify a development that compromises the traditional architectural integrity of the appeal building.
12. The appellant further suggests that the interior has become a popular setting for social media content, contributing to increased visibility and footfall in the wider

area. Notwithstanding this claim, the scope of this appeal is limited to the external alterations to the building's façade. The internal decorative scheme is a matter of personal taste for its occupant. Moreover, there is no convincing or substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that the interior design, or the presence of this individual business, has directly influenced footfall to the area.

13. In summary, the proposed development would conflict with Policies SP1, DM1, C5 and EN1 of the Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012, Policies DC14 and S1.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 and the guidance found within the Manchester City Council Shopfront and Signage Design Guide. These policies and guidance seek for development to strengthen and retain local historic identity through its design, form, materials and detail, which is in keeping with the character of the building and adjoining buildings.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and in taking all material considerations into account, the appeal should be dismissed.

J Smith

INSPECTOR