



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2025 by E Nutman BA (Hons)

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/25/3364324

25 Woodland Avenue, Manchester M18 7HT

- 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 Colin Tebb on behalf of E.ON against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 140072/FH/2024.
 - The development proposed is described as 'External wall insulation front and back of the property. Colour grey'.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The development has already been carried out. Therefore, I have considered the proposal on the basis that planning permission is sought retrospectively.
4. The planning application that led to this appeal was made by E.ON on behalf of the householder at that time. As part of this appeal, written confirmation has been provided that Mr Colin Tebb has been instructed by E.ON to make the appeal. I have therefore included this in the banner heading for this decision.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. 25 Woodland Avenue is a mid-terrace dwelling. The front building line of the terrace sits directly on the boundary with the public footway. The terrace is mainly characterised by brickwork facades, some of which have been painted. Even where paint has been applied, the front elevations retain distinctive features, including decorative arches above recessed front doors as well as windows with stone sills and brick patterned headers. Rear elevations are also predominantly brickwork. Cream render has been applied in some limited instances and in those cases it sits almost flush with the original façade. These shared characteristics give the terrace

much uniformity which positively contributes to the character and appearance of the street.

7. Due to its projection from both the front and rear facades of the host dwelling, the external wall insulation disrupts the established wall alignment of the wider terrace. Its impact is particularly pronounced on the front elevation, given its proximity to the public footway and the absence of the characteristic detailing above doorways and windows. Moreover, the smooth finish, grey colour and the PVC cap below the eaves on both elevations starkly contrasts with the uniformity of the wider terrace, detracting from the overall character and consistency of the street.
8. The examples cited by the appellant relate to properties in different locations and contexts. The evidence indicates that the dwelling at '18 Park Street, Droylsen' is set back from the highway and that render is a well-established feature within that street scene. In the case of '3 Coniston Grove', the quote from the related officer report includes that the host dwelling in that instance was sited at the end of a row and that the wider street was primarily made up of rendered semi-detached dwellings. In any case, these examples do not form part of, nor contribute to, the character of Woodland Avenue and therefore do not justify the site-specific harm identified.
9. I conclude, the development has a harmful effect on the character of the host dwelling and surrounding area. In that regard, it conflicts with Policies EN1, SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester City Council Core Strategy (2012) (Updated 2024), and saved Policy DC1 of The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) which seek good design and require that development includes appropriate materials and detail, protects and enhances the built environment, and that regard is given to the overall appearance of the proposal in the street-scene.

Other Matters

10. The appellant contends that permitted development rights would allow for the addition of render to the wider terrace due to it not being located within a conservation area. However, even outside conservation areas, the 'Conditions' under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 require that materials used in any exterior work must be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse. Therefore, any permitted development rights which may exist for the wider terrace are not comparable to the appeal proposal. In any case, I have considered the proposal on the basis that planning permission is applied for, taking into account the existing site context.
11. The Council's reason for refusal also references JP-S1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (2024). This Policy primarily relates to tackling climate change and requires that development should aim to maximise its economic, social and environmental benefits. Whilst the external wall insulation has the potential to increase energy efficiency, in the context of a single dwelling, any environmental benefits would be significantly undermined by the harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Nutman

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Russell

INSPECTOR