Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/25/3375012
55 Mellington Avenue, Didsbury, Manchester M20 5WE

- 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 Patrick Chapman against the decision of Manchester City Council.
- The application Ref is 142887/FH/2025.
- The development proposed is the erection of a hip to gable roof conversion and rear roof dormer.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling which has been extended, including by the erection of a 2-storey side addition. Together with part of the original roof, this addition's roof possesses a lower ridge height than the property's main roof. This stepping down in height is gradual and is achieved by a sloping roof rather than a sudden change in height. Although there is a stepping down in the ridge height, the roof retains the hipped roof form of the original property.

4. No side extension has been erected at 53 Mellington Avenue which forms part of this pair of semi-detached dwellings. This pair of dwellings already possesses an unbalanced appearance because of the alterations to the property. This unbalanced appearance is accentuated by the siting of the 2-storey side addition at No. 57 directly abutting the flank wall of the extended appeal property.

5. The area surrounding the property comprises similar 2-storey semi-detached dwellings which are sited away from the footways to the rear of front gardens which are landscaped and used for parking. Some of these other dwellings have been altered by the erection of roof and side extensions of varying sizes and designs, including 2 properties with dormer extensions within their side roofslopes. By reason of their design, scale and resulting roof form, the properties with side dormer extensions do not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the streetscene. The design of the dwellings with 2-storey side

extensions generally includes a gradual stepping down in the roof height in a similar manner to the property.

6. The proposed development includes the erection of a rear dormer extension which would involve an increase in the ridge height of the roof across the width of the original property. There would be a stepping down from the ridge of the proposed roof extension to the ridge of the retained hipped roof above the side addition.

7. By reason of the proposed dormer's side elevation, there would be a sudden, rather than gradual, change in the height of the proposed ridge and the hipped roof of the 2-storey side extension. When viewed from the street, this would result in a visually and physically awkward juxtaposition between the existing and proposed ridges. Further, there would be a significantly sized and bulky dormer erected within the property's original rear roofslope. Overall, the scale and design of the appeal scheme would fail to reflect the general character and appearance of the host property and other nearby dwellings.

8. Although there are variations in the design of roofs, this awkward juxtaposition is not exhibited in other extended dwellings within the streetscene within which the property is situated. The design of the resulting property would be an incongruous addition to the streetscene which would not reflect the prevailing character of the roofscape of this residential area. Further, the proposed increase in the width of the roof's full height would further unbalance the character and appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings.

9. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would conflict with Policies EN1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (CS) and Policy DC1 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan. Amongst other matters, these policies refer to proposals being appropriate in terms of scale, form and massing and also reinforcing and enhancing the local character. Residential extensions should reflect the general character of the property, not be excessively large or bulky and not be out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding streetscene. CS Policy SP1 is a generic policy concerning spatial principles rather than criteria for the assessment of householder extensions.

Other Matters

10. Reference is made in the Planning Officer's report to the proposed development having an overbearing impact and harming residential amenity. However, concerns related to potential harm being caused to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties are not specifically addressed in the reason for refusal. Although there would be an outlook from the rear windows of the proposed dormer, this would primarily be towards the railway and would not materially increase the degree of overlooking of neighbouring properties to such an extent so as to be unacceptable. However, this matter does not alter the conclusion reached on the Main Issue and, accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR