



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2025 by Sara Manson DipTP

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/25/3368918

14 Grange Drive, Manchester M9 7AL

- 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 Bradley against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 142264/FH/2025.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'two storey side extension, two storey rear extension, rear dormer, hip to gable roof'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on a) the character and appearance of the area; and b) the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 16 Grange Drive (No. 16) with specific regard to outlook, light and privacy.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is an end terraced dwelling, situated on a prominent corner plot at the junction of Grange Drive and Lea Drive. It appears to have been extended at single storey to the rear and has a large timber clad shed like building to the side, with a small rear garden. The immediate area is residential and comprises similar dwellings set back from the highway with small front gardens. The property has a hipped roof (a distinguishing characteristic of Grange Drive and surrounding area), and the dwellings, by virtue of limited visible alterations and uniform height and width, lend a pleasant cohesive rhythm to the street which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. Both side and rear extensions, by virtue of their height and width, would appear as overly large, visually dominant additions. While the shallow roof pitch proposed at the rear would be unreflective of the original form of the host building. The proposals would not only be building upon an established footprint. The garden shed like structure referred to as part thereof is vastly different from the appeal proposals. While the flat roof elements may appear minor in isolation, they would

contribute to a design that is inconsistent with the established character of the surrounding street scene, exacerbating the overall visual harm. While other side extensions have been cited, they vary significantly in age, design, and scale. As such, they do not justify an extension of the size and design proposed in this appeal scheme. For the reasons outlined, the proposals would be inappropriate in their context.

6. The proposed dormer window would not be set down from the ridge and would occupy almost the entire width of the roof slope, including the proposed side extension. This would result in an overly large, boxy and incongruous addition that would significantly erode the original quality of the roof's shape, appearing disproportionately large compared to neighbouring dwellings. While a dormer window could potentially be constructed under permitted development rights, it is evident to me that this fallback position would result in a development of significantly lesser scale than that which is currently proposed. Consequently, I do not consider it to be a comparable alternative. In addition, the appeal decision referred to is not directly similar, with the Inspector expressly acknowledging the existence of multiple rear dormer extensions within the street and observing that public visibility of the development was limited.
7. The hipped to gable roof would introduce a jarring and inharmonious element that would disrupt the architectural rhythm and symmetry of the terrace. The inclusion of front elevation rooflights would add to this discordance, introducing features uncharacteristic of the area.
8. Given the property's prominent position, the visual impact of the proposals would be particularly pronounced, reinforcing the perception of an overdeveloped site. The proposals would be clearly visible from public vantage points, exacerbating the harm to the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposed development would conflict with Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester's Local Development Framework, Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) (CS) and Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) (UDP). As well as guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework, which, amongst other things, seek to ensure new development is of appropriate scale, form and massing, having regard for the design and appearance of the surrounding area.

Living Conditions

9. The existing single storey extension is built partly on the boundary with No. 16, which also appears to have been extended with a single storey rear extension and conservatory. The proposed first floor addition would not significantly increase the sense of overbearing to a degree that would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook for the occupiers of No. 16. Nor would it create an oppressive sense of enclosure, given that the nearest ground floor habitable windows of No. 16 are located beyond the proposed extension. The proposal would have only a marginal impact on the amount of morning light reaching the upstairs bedroom and would not noticeably darken the room or significantly alter its outlook, which remains primarily over an open, unobstructed rear garden.
10. Although the proposed rear bedroom window would extend beyond the existing fenestration, due to the limited size of the rear gardens, it would not materially increase the availability of views into No. 16's garden. As such, I am satisfied that

the occupiers of No. 16 would continue to enjoy a good standard of privacy. Accordingly, the proposals would not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Therefore, they would accord with Policies SP1 and DM1 of the CS, and Policy DC1 of the UDP, which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development does not result in a loss of amenity for neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matter

11. I am aware that one of the purposes for the proposal is to provide separate ground floor living accommodation for one of the occupants of the dwelling due to personal circumstances. In considering my recommendation, I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty set out under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, particularly the need to eliminate discrimination against persons with protected characteristics of age and/or disability, advancing equality of opportunity for those persons and fostering good relations between them and others.
12. However, it has not been adequately demonstrated that the proposal is the only way of providing for those personal circumstances at the site. Therefore, the potential benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the harm that has been identified and interference with the duty under the above act is proportionate in this case and the refusal of planning permission justified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. Whilst I have found for the appellant on the second main issue, this is as a result of a lack of harm which would be a neutral matter. There are no material considerations that would attract sufficient weight to indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan with which the appeal scheme would conflict owing to my findings on the first main issue. It is for this reason that I recommend the appeal is dismissed.

Sara Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR