The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2012

by M J Single DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 May 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/12/2173846
8 Elford Grove, Manchester, M18 7NB

- 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 Mrs C Miranda against the decision of Manchester City Council.
- The application Ref 097943/FH/2011/N2 was refused by notice dated 12 March 2012.
- The development proposed is a double storey side extension and single storey extensions.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension and single storey extensions at 8 Elford Grove, Manchester, M18 7NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 097943/FH/2011/N2 dated 25 November 2011, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: E02 Rev A and L02 Rev A dated 17.01.12.

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main issue

2. I consider there to be one main issue in this appeal, namely the effect of the development on the street scene and the character of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof, one of a substantial number of similar properties on Elford Grove, Kingsdale Road and Clumber Road. I noted on my visit that a number of properties in these roads have been extended in a similar manner to the appeal proposal. The Council's principal concern is in respect of the extent to which the first floor extension would be set back from the front of the dwelling, yet I noted several on the estate of a similar size, design and set back which, in my judgement, do not have a detrimental impact on the individual properties, their neighbours or the character and appearance of the street scene. I do not concur with the Council's perception that the situation at the appeal site is substantially

different to these others, and potentially more intrusive, by reason of the property standing forward of no.10.

4. The Council refer to Unitary Development Plan Policies DC1 and H2.2 in support of the refusal of permission. The former sets out criteria against which planning applications for residential extensions are to be assessed, but these do not appear to include any standards or guidelines in respect of setting back side extensions, which need to be assessed on their individual merits. Both policies seek to prevent development that would have an unacceptable impact, through their scale and appearance, on the character of a residential area. In my opinion the appeal proposal would accord with the general objectives of the UDP policies cited and would not appear visually intrusive, either in the street scene or in its relationship with neighbouring properties.

5. I have considered the representations received from the occupiers of no. 10 Elford Grove and had the opportunity to view the appeal site from that property. Whilst the proposal raises party wall issues these are private matters between the respective parties. I acknowledge that the proposal may have some impact on sunlight to the conservatory at no. 10 but this is not a habitable room and the loss, taking account of the orientation of the properties, would not be sufficient to justify the refusal of planning permission.

6. Taking account of all of these matters I conclude that the proposal would be acceptable. It would not have an adverse effect on the street scene and the character of the area, and would not conflict with the general aims of UDP Policies DC1 and H2.2.

7. In allowing the appeal I have imposed the standard time condition, and a materials condition to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development. I have also specified that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, both for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Martyn Single

INSPECTOR