



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/W/25/3368163

338-340 Dickenson Road, Longsight, Manchester M13 0NG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mohammed Hussain against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 141323/FO/2024.
 - The development proposed is steel canopy over shopfronts.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for steel canopy over shopfronts at 338-340 Dickenson Road, Longsight, Manchester M13 0NG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 141323/FO/2024, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby approved shall be maintained in accordance with drawing no PL01 - Existing & proposed plans & elevations.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development given above is taken from the application form. I have, however, omitted the words 'retrospective application for' as it does not describe an act of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is situated in a mixed commercial and residential area at the corner of Dickenson Road and Albert Place. It is in retail use and forms part of a group of commercial premises, that is outside of, but close to, the vibrant Longsight District Centre. In front of the group is a deep forecourt that extends along Dickenson Road and the side elevation of the appeal premises adjoining Albert Place. The front of the appeal premises is partially used for the display of goods. Nonetheless, due to the width of the pavement, in combination with the extent of unobstructed forecourt that is retained, there is a sense of spaciousness that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
5. A shallow pitched cantilevered canopy has been installed across the entire Dickenson Road frontage, over the entrance positioned on the splayed corner of the building, and along part of the Albert Place elevation. It is constructed of profiled corrugated metal sheeting over a metal frame, supported by cantilevered

posts. It therefore contrasts with the red bricks and grey slate pitched roof that is characteristic of the appeal property and surrounding buildings. In addition, it differs from the appearance of the retractable awning also located within the group.

6. Nevertheless, due to its dark, recessive grey colour and position on the building, the canopy does not appear as a prominent or dominant feature on the host building or within the street scene, despite it being fixed and non-retractable. As it is consistent with, and sympathetic to, the commercial character of the nearby Longsight District Centre, it does not appear as an unexpected or alien feature in the street scene, nor does it create unacceptable visual clutter even though it is seen in the context of the shop signage. Furthermore, whilst the canopy projects 2.5 metres from the building, as it does not extend to the ground and is set back a considerable distance from the highway, it does not erode the open and spacious character at the corner of Dickenson Road and Albert Place.
7. Accordingly, I find that the development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property or the area. It would, therefore, comply with policies DM1, EN1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy, adopted July 2012 and updated March 2024, and Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document, adopted March 2024. Such policies seek to ensure that development is of a high quality, protects the built environment and reflects local character.

Other Matters

8. The Council has referred to the canopy presenting an opportunity for loitering and the potential for it to become a focal point for anti-social behaviour. Such concerns are not, however, referred to within the reason for refusal, and there is no robust evidence before me that demonstrates that the appeal development would result in material harm in this regard to justify its dismissal.

Conditions

9. I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is maintained in accordance with the submitted plans, to control and define the development which is granted. I have not considered it necessary, however, to include reference to the planning application as it does not assist in defining the approved development.
10. There is nothing before me to support the conclusion that the canopy creates floor space, or results in a material change of use of the forecourt. As such, it is unclear how it could be 'used' for a separate Class E use or for any other purpose. Therefore, I am not satisfied that the second condition suggested by the Council is necessary, relevant to the development or reasonable. I have not, therefore, imposed it.

Conclusion

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

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR