The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2013

by Richard Clegg BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 August 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/13/2201496
11 Chervil Close, Manchester, M14 7DP

- 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 K Agravat against the decision of Manchester City Council.
- The application Ref 102247/FH/2013/S1, dated 19 April 2013, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2013.
- The development proposed is the change of use of the garage to a study, with an extension to the external front drive to provide additional parking and a new footway crossing.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issues in this appeal are:

   (i) The effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

   (ii) The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Highway safety

3. No 11 Chervil Close currently has two parking spaces: one in the garage and the second on the drive. The space lost through the change of use of the garage would be replaced by another being made available on the widened drive. The proposal would not, therefore, result in an increase in on-street parking and there would be no consequential reduction in highway safety. In this respect there would be no conflict with the provisions of Policy DM 1 of the Manchester Core Strategy or the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Character and appearance

4. No 11 Chervil Close is a three storey house on a modern residential development. The properties, which comprise houses and flats, are relatively closely grouped and are generally set back a short distance from the footway. They present a strong built form, to which the front gardens and boundary planting, although limited in extent, provide an important element of contrast in the street scene.

5. At the appeal site, the existing drive lies between the western boundary and the path to the front of the house, and there is a small lawn on the eastern side of the path. The widening of the drive would result in the loss of just over half of the lawn, leaving a narrow strip about 1m wide. On the other side of the lawn is the drive to No 15, which extends back between the two houses. Although the proposal would only result in one additional parking space in front of the house, the widened drive would extend across the greater part of the area between the dwelling and the footway, in close proximity to the longer drive at No 15. Parking does occur on drives and on the carriageway along Chervil Drive, but I am concerned that the extent of hardsurfacing at and immediately adjacent to No 11, together with the loss of part of the lawn at the appeal site, would damagingly effect the street scene on this part of the road. Although there is a hedge on the western side of the site, the widened drive and the extent of parking on the frontage would be readily apparent in the immediate locality, and they would have a significantly adverse impact.

6. I conclude that the proposed development would be damaging to the character and appearance of the area. It would thereby conflict with that part of Policy DM 1 of the Core Strategy, which requires that all development should have regard to its impact on the surrounding area in terms of its appearance, and with paragraph 58 of the NPPF, which, amongst other matters, makes it clear that developments should be visually attractive.

Conclusion

7. The lack of harm in respect of highway safety does not justify development which would harm the character and appearance of the area. My overall conclusion, having regard to all matters raised, is that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Clegg

INSPECTOR