
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 March 2023

by S Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/22/3308173

7 Burnham Drive, Manchester M19 2JJ

- 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 Miss Tasneem Ganijee against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 134068/FH/2022, dated 15 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is side and rear double storey extension and front and rear single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. Burnham Drive comprises mainly two-storey semi-detached properties built to a similar size and appearance, generally set out at regular intervals with gaps between the pairs. The road itself is narrow but nevertheless the modest scale and regular layout of the houses provides the street with a pleasant sense of space and uniformity. No 7 conforms to that pattern being a two-storey property with a driveway to the side forming a gap between it and its neighbour No 9 Burnham Drive, with a garage set back from it. No 9 is of a similar arrangement with a driveway at the side.
4. The proposal seeks to extend No 7 at the side and rear to provide additional living accommodation. The two-storey side extension, which would project back beyond the rear elevation of the house and wrap around the rear elevation, would extend sideways to approximately 0.9m from the side boundary of the property with No 9. The ground floor of the extension would be flush with the front elevation and the first floor would be set back by 0.9m. In addition to that a single storey element is proposed at the rear between the two-storey extension and the boundary with No 5.
5. Policy DC1.4 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan (UDP) sets out that the Council will seek to ensure that: a. The development potential of the gap

between detached and semi-detached houses is capable of being shared equally by the owners or occupiers of the two properties concerned, b. The actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a terracing effect, where this would be unsympathetic to the character of the street as a whole, and c. The actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a very narrow gap between the between the properties, or any other unsatisfactory visual relationships between elements of the building involved.

6. The proposal would increase the bulk of the building towards the side boundary leaving a gap of 0.90m, as such significantly reducing the space at the side of the property. If the neighbouring property were extended in a similar manner, the potential for which is noted in the policy above, the resulting gap between the two properties would be just 1.8m. Given the bulk of the extended buildings, such a narrow gap would not be sufficient to offset the size and scale of the extended houses and maintain the spaciousness of the street scene. Whilst I acknowledge the attempt to reduce the massing of the extended building by setting the first floor back, and lowering the ridgeline, the set back would in itself be limited and would have little effect on the apparent bulk of the building. Accordingly, it would not be sufficient to mitigate against the loss of the gap. As such the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the spatial arrangement and quality of the street and would thereby cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
7. I acknowledge that some properties within the street have already been extended by way of side extensions. A number of the houses have single-storey side extensions which extend up to the common boundary. These extensions leave a gap at first floor which provides a clear separation between buildings. This enables the rhythm of the properties to be appreciated and space to be retained in the street scene.
8. There are also examples, albeit relatively few, of two-storey side extensions in the street. These include a two-storey side extension at No 6, opposite the site. However, that property itself is set back from its neighbour, No 4, rather than being in alignment with it and accordingly the extension is not unduly prominent in the street scene. No 20 has a two-storey side extension that sits flush with the frontage and appears to extend up to the side boundary. This development appears to be contrary to the Council's policy although there are no details before me of the circumstances in which it was approved, which may not be directly comparable with those of the appeal before me. Moreover, these extensions do not reflect the predominant layout or character of the street as set out above and do not therefore justify the proposed development.
9. I have also been provided with photographs of extensions to properties in the wider area, some of which are not good examples of development to follow. However, again these examples do not reflect the character of Burnham Drive, and accordingly carry limited weight in my considerations.
10. For the above reasons the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to Policy DC1.4 of the UDP. In addition, it would be contrary to Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 which requires that development should have regard to the

character of the surrounding area with particular regard to its scale and appearance and should protect and enhance the built environment.

11. I have taken into consideration that the extension would provide additional living accommodation for the occupiers of the property. This private benefit carries moderate weight in support of the scheme. However, given the harm to the character and appearance of the area carries significant weight, the benefit of the proposal does not indicate that permission should be granted contrary to the development plan.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above and taking into account all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR