



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/25/3359612

71 Guildford Road, Manchester M19 3ER

- 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 Ms Parveen Anwar against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 141244/FH/2024.
 - The development proposed is erection of a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. It is considered that the main issues are the effects of the proposed development on (a) the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene, and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling situated on a corner plot within a predominantly residential area. The design of the property is similar in character and appearance as the dwellings fronting Morely Drive and the pair of dwelling sited on the opposite side of Morely Drive's junction with Guildford Road. The property has been extended with single storey additions to the side, rear and front.
4. The proposed development includes the erection of a first floor extension above the side addition and, as such, there would be no increase in the footprint of this already extended property. There would remain an area of garden between the side elevation of the appeal scheme and the fence which defines the shared boundary with the footway along Morely Drive.
5. The existing side addition is in excess of half the width of the property which already gives this pair of semi-detached dwellings an unbalanced appearance. The erection of the proposed development would accentuate the physical and visual unbalancing of this pair of semi-detached dwellings and this would be detrimental to the streetscene along Guildford Road. Further, because of its scale the resulting 2-storey extension would also not appear a subservient addition to the host

property, especially when assessed cumulatively with the existing rear and front additions.

6. There is a consistency in the siting of all the dwellings fronting Morely Drive to the rear of front gardens. The original side elevation of the property was sited to align with the front elevations of 1 and 3 Morely Drive. The property's single storey addition projects into the side garden but it is not so conspicuous so as to be materially harmful to the streetscene. However, the resulting 2-storey addition that would be created by the proposed extension would accentuate of built development projecting forward of the front elevations of Nos. 1 and 3. By reason of siting and scale, the resulting property would be a conspicuous and prominent feature within the streetscene along Morely Drive.
7. On this issue, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene, and, as such it would conflict with Policy DC1 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.
8. CS Policies SP1 and EN1 containing key design principles rather than being development management type of policies for householder schemes. However, this matter does not affect the assessment of the appeal.

Living Conditions

9. Although the resulting property would be a conspicuous and prominent feature within the streetscene along Morely Drive, it would neither be an overbearing form of development nor adversely affect the outlook of the occupiers of the dwellings fronting this road. These occupiers would generally retain their outlook from their front windows and views along the road towards the recreation ground.
10. The rear elevation of the proposed extension would not project further than the rear wall of the host property at first floor level. Within the existing rear elevation are 2 windows at first floor level which serve habitable rooms. These windows have an outlook towards 1 Morely Drive. This neighbouring dwelling is sited about 8 metres from the property's rear elevation. Although an additional window is proposed, because of its siting the outlook from this opening would be primarily towards the front garden and side elevation of No. 1 rather than overlook the private amenity space at the rear. Accordingly, there would be no unacceptable loss of privacy associated with the outlook from the proposed window.
11. By reason of siting and acknowledging the angled boundary between the property and No. 1, the proposed first floor extension would not adversely affect levels of sunlight and daylight reaching the rear garden of No. 1 and the windows within the side elevation. These windows appear to serve a kitchen and a staircase rather than bedrooms or living rooms. If there were to be a reduction in daylight and sunlight reaching the curtilage of No. 1 it would only potentially affect the front garden which is not normally as important to the occupiers' enjoyment of their property when compared to private amenity space. Further, because of the

separation distance and siting, the resulting property would not be an overbearing form of development in the outlook from the windows and the front garden of No. 1.

12. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and, as such, there would not be a conflict with UDP Policy DC1 and CS Policy DM1. Amongst other matters, these policies refer to development having regard to its effects on amenity and residential extensions not causing undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy.

Other Matters

13. The appellant has provided information about the current circumstances of a family member as a reason for needing the proposed extension. However, the needs of this family member can change, as indeed could the occupiers of the property at a future date. Any harmful effects associated with the proposed extension would endure beyond meeting the family member's current needs and, as such, limited weight is given to this matter in the determination of this appeal.

Conclusion

14. 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, in particular the streetscene. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR