
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by M Clowes BA (Hons) MCD PG CERT (Arch Con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/25/3360903

42 Grangethorpe Drive, Manchester, M19 2NE

- 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 Z Chaudhary against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application reference is 139810/FH/2024.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side and rear extension, front bay canopy extended and additional dormers to front and rear.
-

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 description in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. However, for the purposes of conciseness, I have removed the wording which relates to a reference number as it is not a description of development.
4. The Council's decision notice includes three reasons for refusal. However, these all relate to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. I have defined the main issue on that basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated within a residential area. Grangethorpe Drive is primarily characterised by a mix of two-storey semi-detached and detached dwellings. These generally feature hipped and gable roofs. Aside from some subtle roof lights, the front roof slopes are mostly unaltered. Front extensions are generally limited to porches which are of a modest scale. Where there are two-storey side extensions in the area, these are typically setback and appear subservient to their respective host dwellings.
7. I accept that the diversity of dwelling styles along Grangethorpe Drive contributes to a mixed street scene. However, amongst this variety, there are numerous pairs of semi-detached dwellings which have a mostly matching appearance. This includes

the appeal property which alongside the adjoining dwelling, displays a balance and symmetry, particularly in terms of their unbroken hipped roofs and their similar front elevations. Moreover, they occupy one of the more prominent positions in the street scene, owed to their location at the corner of Grangethorpe Drive and Lynton Drive. Overall, with its pleasing design, balance and prominent position, the appeal property, contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

8. The annotated aerial view supplied in the Council's officer report indicates that buildings within the vicinity of the appeal site typically follow uniform building lines. Although sited perpendicular to the dwellings on Lynton Drive, nonetheless the current side elevation of the dwelling is consistent with the front elevation of the dwellings to the north. Due to its sideways projection, its height and depth, the proposed extension would result in a dominating and enclosing effect on the street scene that would not be mitigated by the retained separation gap to the side or rear.
9. Furthermore, the combination of the scale and mass of the two-storey side and rear extension, together with its lack of set-back and set-down at the first floor and roof level, it would appear as dominant and bulky. The dwelling would be subsumed by the proposed extension such that its original form would no longer be readable, particularly from the front. The extended dwelling would therefore appear excessively wide in comparison to the adjoining dwelling, which combined with its gable ended roof form, would erode their balance and symmetry. Whilst other semi-detached properties have been extended to the side, they typically have features to ensure that they appear subservient and secondary to the original dwelling.
10. Even though the dormer windows would be of a modest scale, their flat roof design would not assimilate with the pitched roof form of the host dwelling. Furthermore, the front dormer window would detract from the otherwise plain front roof slopes along Grangethorpe Drive. Their off-centred position towards the edge of the roof would further draw the eye. The dormer windows would therefore be discordant additions to the host dwelling.
11. The front bay canopy extension would span the ground floor front elevation of the host dwelling, and its roof line would extend up to the first-floor windows. This would unacceptably contrast with the mostly modest porch extensions along Grangethorpe Drive. Columns are not a feature of the existing dwelling or neighbouring properties where any canopy roofs found, are of the cantilevered variety. Therefore, the front bay canopy extension would be a further incongruous addition to the host dwelling.
12. Although the dwelling is not a listed building, positioned within a conservation area or subject to an article 4 direction and views would be relatively localised, the extensions would nonetheless fail to be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. The extensions would not be subservient, and cumulatively they would erode the balance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellings. Furthermore, the proposal would introduce discordant design features which would appear incongruous in the area. Consequently, even accounting for the variety in the street scene and the use of matching materials, the proposal would nevertheless be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings.
13. Although 46 Grangethorpe Drive has been extended to the rear, it is a detached dwelling of an individual design which does not form a corner plot. The relevance of

the view of neighbouring properties and gabled roofs contained in appendix B of the appellant's statement is unclear. Even if I was to accept that gabled roofs are found locally it does not justify the particular scale and form of the development proposed in its entirety. The examples are not directly comparable to the proposal before me.

14. In summary, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies DC1 of The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) and Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester City Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012). Amongst other things, these policies require that extensions should be well designed and subservient and should not be out of character with the style of development in the area by virtue of design.
15. Conflict is also found with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure that new development is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

16. I acknowledge that the appellant's objective is to provide extended and improved accommodation for their family. This is a largely private benefit and there may be other ways of providing additional accommodation without causing the harm identified. The absence of third-party objections does not indicate a lack of harm.
17. The appellant refers to the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Framework is clear that this presumption does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision-making. Where a proposal conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not usually be granted unless material considerations indicate that the plan should not be followed. I have found that the proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations to indicate I should take a different view.

Conclusion and Recommendation

18. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations, which would outweigh this finding. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Clowes

INSPECTOR