Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2010

by Christopher Checkley
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:
17 March 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/A/09/2117445

219 Brantingham Road, Chorlton cum Hardy, Manchester, M21 0TP

- 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 Ghulum Mustafa against the decision of Manchester City Council.
- The application Ref 089030/FH/2009/S1, dated 10 February 2009, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2009.
- The development proposed is double-storey extension and single-storey extension housing kitchen and disabled toilet facility.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issues

2. There are 2 main issues regarding the effects of the proposed extensions. First, the effect upon the appearance and character of the host building and the area in general. Second, the effect upon the living conditions of the neighbouring residents at No 221 Brantingham Road with particular regard to levels of overshadowing and visual impact.

Reasons

Appearance and character

3. The appeal site is a 3-bed semi-detached house on a relatively shallow corner plot. It has already been extended to the rear with a full-width single-storey extension to both the kitchen and dining room. An unauthorised single-storey wooden conservatory links the rear of the extended house with the garage at the end of the short back garden. There is also an unauthorised car port against the side of the house.

4. The surrounding residential area is typified by two-storey semi-detached houses set out in a well ordered layout with strong building lines being evident. Long rear gardens create an impression of openness. Quite a number have single-storey side and/or rear extensions. A smaller number have two-storey side and/or rear extensions, although generally these are part rather than full-width.

5. The appeal site has an uncharacteristically shallow rear garden that is apparent in either direction from Morville Road. The resultant two-storey section would have its ridge below the level of the main house. However, it would project some 3.65 m in depth across the whole of the rear elevation of the house, right

up to the boundary. The single-storey element would link with the existing garage, tying it in visually with the remainder of the house to create a single building mass. The full length of the rear garden would be taken up by a long and wide building extending backwards across the full width of the main house.

6. In terms of scale and proportions the new extensions proposed would dominate the original property. The cumulative effect of the existing and proposed extensions would be a property that would appear excessively lengthy and bulky in relation to both its relatively restricted plot and most other houses in the area. The sense of openness characterised by corner plots would also be reduced by this overdevelopment.

7. Planning permission was granted in 2001 for a first-floor rear bedroom extension over only the kitchen area. That extension was not built and permission has lapsed. The evidence before me is that the first floor element was significantly narrower than the first floor element of the appeal scheme and that it also left a gap between the extension and the shared boundary with the other semi-detached house. It does not represent a precedent.

8. My attention has been directed to several extended properties in the neighbourhood. The large extensions at 23 Morville Road are the subject of enforcement investigations. The rear extension at 190 Brantingham Road on the opposite corner did not appear to be exactly the same as the scheme before me. None of the other cases appeared directly comparable to the appeal scheme. I make my decision on the individual merits of the appeal proposals.

9. I conclude that the proposed extensions would harm the appearance and character of the host dwelling and this part of the local residential area, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.3 and H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

Living conditions of the neighbouring residents

10. The 3.65 m depth of the first floor extension would considerably overshadow the neighbouring property to the west at No 221 Brantingham Road. The harmful effect would be lessened as a result of the neighbour having an existing single-storey rear extension. However, the first floor rear bedroom windows experience a significant loss of morning sunlight and an increased visual impact. Although these effects would be insufficient to justify refusal on their own, they do add to the weight against the scheme.

11. I conclude that there would be a small but material diminution of the living conditions of the semi-detached neighbours, contrary to the provisions of UDP Policies DC1.1 and DC1.2.

Other matters

12. I have taken full account of and appreciate the health needs of the appellant's wife for a downstairs bedroom and toilet. However, they are insufficient to outweigh the long-lasting planning objections to this particular extension scheme or to justify the making of an exception to the cited policies.

C J Checkley