Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2008

by Simon Berkeley BA MA 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: 14 October 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/A/08/2078515
427 Wilbraham Road, Chorlton, Manchester M21 0UT

- 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 Mohammed Aslam against the decision of Manchester City Council.
- The application reference 086483/FH/2008/S1, dated 24 April 2008, was refused by notice dated 28 May 2008.
- The development proposed is a two storey rear extension with rear dormer.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for a two storey rear extension with rear dormer at 427 Wilbraham Road, Chorlton, Manchester M21 0UT, in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 086483/FH/2008/S1, dated 24 April 2008, subject to the following conditions.

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   2) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension and dormer window hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural matter

2. Drawing 05A, illustrating the proposed attic plan and submitted with the application, appears to show a new window in the front roof slope of the property. However, as this is not included in the front elevation drawing, or in the description of development, I consider it forms no part of the scheme before me. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Wilbraham Road is part of a principal route into the city. The appeal house is at its junction with Wyverne Road, in a residential neighbourhood. Properties in the immediate vicinity are of different styles and designs. Many have additions of various kinds. Whilst hipped roofs are a dominant feature, they

are not uniform in size or alignment. Although dormer windows are not common here, some are present, and visible from the street. By and large, I consider this assortment of irregular design features gives the area a mixed character and appearance.

5. It would be possible to see the proposed dormer window from the street, including parts of Wilbraham and Wyverne Roads, because of the appeal property's corner position. Nevertheless, in my view, it would not look particularly out of place in the surrounding context. Its modest projection from the roof slope would avoid any substantial visual disruption to the street scene. Furthermore, the trees along the side of the appeal property's rear garden would generally hide it from many viewpoints, when in leaf. Overall, I consider that the dormer would not particularly stand out here, or appear significantly prominent from the street and neighbouring houses.

6. The Council has not raised any objections to the two storey rear extension proposed. As it would roughly align with the rear of the adjacent house, and would not be especially close to any neighbouring properties, I do no differ.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposed rear dormer would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, it would not conflict with Policies H2.2 and DC1.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester. These do not allow development which will have an unacceptable impact on residential areas, having regard to the overall appearance of the proposal in the street scene.

8. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of advice in Circular 11/95. To make sure the development blends with the existing house and surrounding area, I have attached a condition requiring the external materials to be approved by the Council. However, as my decision on this appeal relates only to the scheme shown on the submitted drawings, it is unnecessary to require adherence to them. I have, therefore, not included this condition.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Simon Berkeley

INSPECTOR