

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2023

**by M Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 26 January 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/22/3306973**

**70 Springdale Gardens, Manchester M20 2SS**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Paul and Anne-Celine Holden against the decision of Manchester City Council.
  - The application Ref 133823/FH/2022, dated 19 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2022.
  - The development proposed is two storey side extension, single storey rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling set within a row of similar properties on the southern side of Springdale Gardens. The property is set back from the road with a paved driveway and garden to the front and a larger garden to the rear.
4. The surrounding area is residential and is predominantly characterised by two storey semi-detached dwellings which are set back from the road with gardens and driveways to the front with low level boundary treatments and planting. Though many of the properties along Springdale Gardens have been extended, there is a sense of uniformity largely due to the consistent building lines, broadly even gaps between properties, their bay windows, hipped roofs and commonality of external materials comprising red brick and white render walls and tiled roofs. This results in a well-ordered appearance and spacious feel which contributes positively to the character of the area.
5. The proposal includes a two storey side extension which would be set back from the principal elevation of the property and have a hipped roof which would be set slightly below the existing ridge. The neighbouring property to the south east, No 72, includes a two storey side extension which is flush with the front elevation and retains a gap of about 800mm from the shared boundary.
6. Although the proposed two storey extension would retain a similar gap from the shared boundary, the resulting space between the two properties would be reduced to about 1.6m which would be an uncharacteristically narrow gap

between properties on this road. While I acknowledge that the two storey extension was originally proposed to be flush with the front elevation of the property and that a set back is now proposed, a small set back of around 225mm would not provide sufficient relief from the front of the property. Consequently, when viewed from either end of the road to the north west or the south east, the visual gap between the two properties would not be readily apparent. The combination of the width of the extension and the small set back would create a cramped appearance and a terracing effect with No 72. The proposal would therefore result in an unacceptable loss of openness between the two properties which would be harmful to the established street scene.

7. I have had regard to the examples of other two storey side extensions on Springdale Gardens referred to by the appellants. The two storey side extensions at Nos 19, 23 and 72 do not include set backs. However, I have not been made aware of the circumstances that led to these other extensions being constructed, though the evidence provided indicates they were permitted several years ago prior to the adoption of both the Manchester Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) (Core Strategy) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In the case of Nos 19 and 40, these properties are situated on splayed plots and the two storey extensions retain larger gaps from the adjacent neighbouring properties. The examples provided are therefore not directly comparable to the appeal proposal, which I have considered on its own merits.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would be contrary to saved Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) (UDP) and Policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development has regard to the character of the property and the surrounding area. The proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 130 of the Framework, which, amongst other things, requires development to be sympathetic to local character.
9. The proposed single storey rear extension would represent a modest addition which would be in-keeping with the host property and the area. The Council has not indicated an objection to the single storey rear extension and I have no reason to reach a different view on the basis of the evidence before me. This element of the scheme would accord with saved Policy DC1 of the UDP, Policies DM1 and SP1 of the Core Strategy and paragraph 130 of the Framework. I have considered whether a split decision could be issued for the single storey rear extension, however, such a decision is not possible in this case as it would not be physically separate from the proposed two storey extension.

### **Other Matters**

10. The proposal would create additional living accommodation for the appellants. However, in the form proposed this would be harmful to the character and appearance of the property and the area. I consider that this consideration would not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*M Ollerenshaw* - INSPECTOR