The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 November 2012

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5 December 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/12/2184139
116 Newport Road, Manchester, M21 9WN

- 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 Sarah Wilde against the decision of Manchester City Council.
- The application Ref 099534/FH/2012/S1, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2012.
- The development proposed is two storey extension to side and single storey extension to rear to create enlarged living accommodation.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey extension to side and single storey extension to rear to create enlarged living accommodation at 116 Newport Road, Manchester, M21 9WN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 099534/FH/2012/S1, subject to the following conditions:

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

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PPO1 Rev A.

   3) No development shall commence on site until details and samples of materials to be used in the external walls and roof have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached two storey dwelling, situated within a residential area. Newport Road contains a mixture of house styles, types and ages, including terraces and semi-detached properties. The width of the gaps between properties also varies and the streetscene does not have a predominant form or character. The appeal dwelling is separated from the

neighbouring dwelling at 118 Newport Road by the width of the two driveways serving the properties.

4. The proposal is to erect a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension, which would provide additional kitchen, dining and bedroom/en-suite accommodation space. Although the proposed first floor element of the two storey side extension would be set back from the front wall of the original dwelling by 1 metre, the extension would occupy virtually the full width of the driveway. I note that as a guideline, the Council would normally require a minimum gap of 1.5m between the side wall of the extension and the common boundary. In this case however, it is accepted by the Council that the proposed level of accommodation could not be achieved, if such a gap was retained. The Council also states that the proposal should be considered on "its individual merits".

5. Saved Policy DC1 of the adopted Manchester Unitary Development Plan 1995(UDP) seeks to ensure that proposals for two storey side extensions do not create or have the potential to create a terracing effect, where it would be "unsympathetic to the character of the street as a whole". In my opinion, a terracing effect would not be created, as space between the dwellings would be retained by the existing driveway at number 118. In terms of the potential to create a terrace, no substantive evidence has been put forward to persuade me that such a situation is likely to occur. I note that the Council considers that the first floor element of the side extension should be set back by 2m, but I have considered the current proposal on its merits.

6. Given the mixed character and appearance of Newport Road, and the fact that there are relatively narrow gaps between many other houses on the street, I consider that the proposal would not be at odds with the surrounding built form and that there would be no significant harm to the streetscene. Consequently, it would not conflict with Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document, January 2012, which require new development to make a positive contribution to the area; and to have regard to the character of the surrounding area. In addition, there would be no conflict with Saved Policy DC1 of the UDP which is referred to above.

Conditions

7. The Council has suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. These have been considered in the light of Circular 11/95. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

8. To ensure a satisfactory external appearance, a condition requiring the submission of samples of the external materials to be used is also imposed.

Conclusion

9. It is concluded for the reasons given above, that the appeal should be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR