Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2009

by P G Lloyd BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
7 May 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/A/08/2093358
197 Brantingham Road, Chorlton cum Hardy, Manchester M21 0TT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Dr T Shah against the decision of Manchester City Council.
- The application Ref 086931/FH/2008/S1, dated 31 May 2008, was refused by notice dated 25 July 2008.
- The development proposed is the replacement of hipped roof with gable and construction of a dormer window to rear elevation.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. 197 Brantingham Road is a semi-detached house in a street of similar properties. A distinctive feature of the street is the use of traditional fully hipped roofs throughout. No 197 has been previously extended to the rear with single storey and two storey extensions and the loft space converted into bedroom accommodation with a single roof-light window in the rear roof slope.

4. Policies DC1.2 and H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (UDP) have the objectives of protecting the character and appearance of a dwelling, its surroundings and its neighbours within a flexible policy framework that takes account of the changing needs of households over time.

5. Although the rear dormer extension would not be seen from Brantingham Road or surrounding public roads, it would be visible from the playing field to the south of the site, from neighbouring gardens and from the rear of dwellings fronting Morville Road. It would, however, be relatively well contained within the enlarged roof and I do not find it would be unduly visible nor would its appearance be harmful to the character of the area. As the rear dormer extension is an integral element of the proposed development, I cannot deal with it separately.

6. A number of properties in the surrounding area have side gables juxtaposed with hipped roofs on neighbouring buildings; such relationships are not

unconventional and can, where used appropriately, add variety and interest to a roofscape and streetscene. I do not consider a hip to gable relationship to be visually objectionable in principle.

7. However, I observed no examples of semi-detached dwellings in the vicinity where one half of the roof has been extended so that a gable on one side is conjoined with a dwelling under a hipped roof on the other side, such as would occur in this case. None of the examples given by the appellant fall into this category.

8. The traditional fully hipped roofs on Brantingham Road give the street result in a simple and distinctive roofscape. A gable extension on one side of the semi-detached dwelling would depart significantly from the established roofscape and established character along this part of Brantingham Road. It would clearly unbalance the symmetrical roof pattern of the pair of dwellings which form Nos 195 and 197 and detract from the consistent profile of buildings along the street. Notwithstanding the overall flexibility in the UDP, I find that the impact on the streetscene would be visually jarring, out of character and therefore contrary to the objectives of UDP policy H2.2 and criteria (c) of policy DC1.2.

9. Whilst I acknowledge the appellant's desire to provide additional living accommodation for his family, such personal circumstances do not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

10. I conclude therefore that harmful impact of the side gable extension on the character and appearance of the streetscene is such that the appeal should be dismissed.

P.G Lloyd

INSPECTOR