The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2012

by D R Cullingford BA MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 February 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/12/2168521

55 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 by Ms Nelofar Azim against the decision of the Manchester City Council.
- The application (ref: 09774/FH/2011/S1 and dated 1 November 2011) was refused by notice dated 21 December 2011.
- The development is described as the 'erection of first floor side extension and single storey front extension to form additional living accommodation'.

Decision

1. For the reasons given below, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

2. The appeal property is a fairly modern detached house in a quiet suburban crescent. A 2-storey extension (projecting roughly 4m from the rear wall) and a single storey side addition (projecting to the property boundary) have been erected relating to permissions granted in 1999 and 2003. Recently permission has also been granted for a first floor extension above the existing side addition and a single storey extension to the front. The appeal proposal would be similar to that approved scheme except that the first floor element would extend over the full length of the existing flank wall rather than terminate some 4m back and in line with the original rear elevation. The Council are concerned that the additional extent of the proposal and its position on the property boundary would have an overbearing impact on adjacent residents at no.57, contrary to 'saved' policies H2.2 and DC1. That is the issue on which this appeal turns.

3. I realise that the additional space provided by the appeal proposal at first floor level could accommodate a study and I can appreciate that such a facility might well be much in demand within this busy household. However, as the planning officer points out, the combination of the existing rear extension and the alignment of the appeal property slightly behind no.57, results in the structure projecting over 5m beyond the adjacent rear elevation. Because the side addition extends to the property boundary, the proposal would result in a blank section of flank wall looming above the adjacent property; it would be all too evident at such close quarters from the rear windows and the conservatory there. And, the oppressive presence of the structure would be accentuated by the raised ridge line and the new gable, together emphasising the expanse of the enlarged roof surmounting the extension. I am afraid that such a structure in such a position would present an overbearing and oppressive presence to

neighbouring residents, thereby impairing the prospect that they might reasonably expect to enjoy in a pleasant suburb such as this.

4. I accept that the proposal would differ little from the permitted scheme, but the 2-storey element beyond the adjacent rear elevation actually approved would stand further from the property boundary and, consequently, its impact would be less. I understand that relatives live in the adjacent dwelling and raise no objection to the scheme. But that might not always be so. Nor does it really alter the inherent defects of the scheme. I agree that there appear to be one or two large extensions on this estate close to neighbouring dwellings, but I think that, on the whole, these are the exceptions; they do not necessarily provide a precedent to follow. Hence, and in spite of considering all the other matters raised, I find nothing sufficiently compelling to alter my conclusion that this appeal should be dismissed.



INSPECTOR