Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2008

by N A C Holt **TD BArch(hons) DipTP DipCons RIBA 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:
29 August 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/A/08/2076889/WF
14 Montcliffe Crescent, Whalley Range, Manchester, M16 8GR

- 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 Mr S Ahmed against the decision of Manchester City Council.
- The application Ref 086248/FH/2008/S1, dated 20 March 2008, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2008.
- The development proposed is a first floor rear extension to provide an extra bedroom.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. From all that I have read and seen I consider that the main issues in this case are the effect of the proposal on the streetscene and the effect on the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a modern two storey detached house on an estate comprising mainly detached and semi-detached houses of a similar age. No. 14 occupies a corner site with 2m high timber fencing enclosing the side and the rear of the site. The property already has a single storey side and rear extension.

4. The extension would measure externally 4.08m by 3.14m and would be built over part of the existing single storey rear extension. Having regard to the existing single storey extension that wraps around the side (west) elevation and the rear elevation I consider that the proposal would result in a dwelling that no longer respected the scale and massing of the development in the area. I also consider that the piecemeal additions would result in an unattractive cluttered appearance to this part of the estate. In view of the location of the proposed extension where it would be clearly seen from Montcliffe Crescent, particularly when approaching form the south I consider that the proposal would have a damaging effect on the streetscene and as such the proposal would be contrary to policies DC1 and H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

5. The City Council also consider that the proposal would have an overbearing effect on the outlook from No. 16 Montcliffe Crescent and would also result in

an unacceptable loss of light at this property. Whilst this is a matter of some concern to me, having regard to the set back of the extension from the common boundary between the properties, I do not consider that the impact would be such as to justify the rejection of the proposal for this reason alone.

6. Whilst I appreciate that a similar extension may have recently been accepted at another house on the estate that is also owned by the appellant, I do not consider this to be a reason to accept a proposal that would in my opinion have a damaging impact on the streetscene.

7. I have taken account of all the other points raised in the material before me but these other matters do not alter my conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed.

Neil A C Holt

Inspector