Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2025

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/25/3359619
8 James Leach VC Road, Manchester M40 7PW

- 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 Vikram Goyal against the decision of Manchester City Council.
- The application Ref is 141077/FH/2024.
- The development proposed is the erection of a dormer to the rear roofslope and insertion of skylight windows to the front roofslope and a double/single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The dormer has already been erected and at the time of the site visit there were construction works occurring at the rear of the property but the rear extension had not been completed.

Main Issues

3. It is considered that the main issues are the effects of the appeal scheme on (a) the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers 14 and 16 Varley Street.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey end of terrace dwelling situated within a primarily residential area comprising a mix of 2 and 3 storey buildings with semi-detached and terraced dwellings being the predominant form of housing. There is a consistency in the general form, design and siting of the 2-storey dwellings, including their gable roof forms. There are some variations in design, including 2-storey projecting front gable features. The property has a 2-storey front gable.

5. From what could be observed during the site visit, the dormer extension erected within the property's rear roofslope is the only alteration to the predominantly gabled roofscape associated with the 2-storey dwellings. Although there are examples of single storey additions, no 2-storey extensions were observed within the immediate surrounding area.

6. The evidence identifies that planning permission has been granted for a part single and part 2-storey extension at the property (Ref 140201/FH/2024) but the full details of this approved scheme have not been provided. The appellant claims the rear dormer falls within the tolerances for such an extension to be erected as permitted development. However, it has been explained that the permitted development rights to erect such extensions have been withdrawn by a condition attached to the original planning consent to erect the property (Ref 117055/FO/2017). In the absence of the full details of the previous permission and the reasons why the permitted development rights were withdrawn, the appeal scheme has been assessed on its own planning circumstances.

7. When assessed in isolation from the dormer, the scale and design of the proposed rear extension would be sympathetic to the form and style of the property, in particular echoing the 2-storey projecting front gable. The proposed extension would be set well down below the existing roof's ridge and it would not be the full width of the property. The proposed extension would be a subservient addition to the property.

8. Again, when assessed in isolation from the proposed rear extension, the dormer is set back from the ridge, eaves and side edges of the roof and the external surfaces are hanging tiles which match the original roof. However, when viewed from the wider area, this extension is a prominent addition to the property's rear roof slope. It appears an incongruous form of development which fails to respect the simple form, appearance and character of the gabled roofscape of the surrounding 2-storey terraced dwellings. The consistency of the terrace's roofscape is broken by this large dormer.

   When assessed together, there would also be an awkward juxtaposition between the dormer's rear elevation and the gable roof of the proposed 2-storey rear extension. Further, the cumulative scale of the extensions would result in a development which would not be subservient to the modest size of the host property.

   Accordingly, it is concluded that the appeal scheme would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with Policies DC1.1, DC1.2 and DC1.3 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (UDP) and Policy DM1 of Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (CS). Amongst other matters these policies refer to developments having regard to the character of the surrounding area and for extensions to residential properties to have regard to the general character of the host properties. Further, extensions should not be excessively large or bulky resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses.

9. CS Policies SP1 and EN1 containing key design principles rather than being development management type of policies for householder schemes. UDP Policy DC1.3 does not appear to be directly relevant to the assessment of this appeal scheme in terms of the scale parameters which are referenced. However, these matters do not affect the assessment of this appeal.

   Living Conditions

10. Reference is made by the appellant and the council to the approved scheme requiring the bedroom window that would be relocated within the current side

elevation of the property being obscurely glazed. The purpose of the obscured glazing would be to preclude overlooking of the rear gardens and elevations of 14 and 16 Varley Street thereby maintaining the privacy of the occupiers of these neighbouring properties.

11. For the appeal application, the erection of obscured glazing is not referenced on the submitted drawing. However, if the council remains satisfied that it is appropriate for this relocated bedroom window to be obscurely glazed then this could be secured by a suitable condition and this is a suggested condition if this appeal succeeds.

12. On this issue it is concluded that, with a suitable condition, the appeal scheme would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 14 and 16 Varley Street and, as such, it would not conflict with CS Policy DM1 and UDP Policy DC1 concerning development having regard to its effects on amenity and residential extensions not causing undue loss of privacy.

Conclusion

13. Although the appeal scheme would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, this matter is demonstrably outweighed by the significant harm which would be caused to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR