Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2026

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2026

Appeal Ref: 6014028
48 Topfield Road, Manchester M22 9QN

- 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 Yogendra Mohottala against the decision of Manchester City Council.
- The application reference is PLA-2026-000396.
- The development is a retrospective application for rear conservatory.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The proposed development is complete. It appears to be broadly in accordance with the plans.

3. A new National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 17 August 2026. It replaces the previous version that is cited in the reasons for refusal. As the Framework is a material consideration, I have had regard to it in reaching my decision. The Framework does not raise any new matters that are determinative to the outcome of this appeal.

Main issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the development firstly, on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings; and secondly, on the living conditions of the occupiers of 50 Topfield Road with particular regard to visual impact and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal property is a mainly 2-storey end terrace house that has been extended and externally altered. It lies within an estate style residential area within which there is some variety to the scale, design, type and appearance of dwellings.

6. The new conservatory attaches to the back wall of the existing rear addition, and projects into the rear garden of No 48. Taken together, the existing extension and new conservatory result in a substantial rearward projection from the original rear wall of the host dwelling. Their combined depth is far greater than 3.65 metres, beyond which Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (UDP) states that rearward extensions will not normally be approved.

7. The new conservatory is also considerable in width, extending across a major part of the rear elevation of No 48. The combined depth, width and mass of the new conservatory and the existing rear extension cause them to visually dominate the rear of the host dwelling, unduly distort its scale and proportions, and detract from its character and appearance.

8. The new conservatory is not readily visible from public vantage points given its position at the back of No 48, away from the road. It therefore has little effect on the public realm. Nevertheless, the development is evident from the rear of neighbouring properties, notably 50 Topfield Road, which is attached to the appeal dwelling. From this vantage point in particular, the new conservatory appears as an overly large and visually prominent addition that relates poorly to the visual character of the host dwelling and its immediate surroundings. It appears as an obtrusive and unsympathetic addition even when seen among the varied built form that is a characteristic of the local area.

Living conditions

9. The side elevation of the new conservatory is set back from, although still close to, the shared rear boundary with No 50. Although single storey in height, the upper part of the development projects noticeably above the timber fence that marks this common boundary, as does the rear extension to which it attaches.

10. Given the considerable depth of built form adjacent to this boundary, and its proximity to it, the existing extension and new conservatory have a visually dominant and enclosing presence for the occupiers of No 50. This is most pronounced when seen from the patio and garden closest to this neighbouring house and its ground-floor rear window.

11. Although I saw that a more open aspect from these locations remains towards the far end of the garden, this does not materially reduce the unduly enclosing effect experienced closest to the house. I therefore find that the development has an overbearing effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 50.

12. At my site visit, I saw that the upper panels in the side elevation of the new conservatory were obscurely glazed, which limited views towards the rear garden of No 50. If this type of glazing were to be retained, which could be secured by a condition, there would be no significant loss of privacy to the occupiers of No 50, whether through actual or perceived overlooking.

Conclusion on the main issues

13. On the main issues, I conclude that the development causes significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its immediate surroundings. It also has an overbearing effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 50.

14. Accordingly, the development conflicts with Policies DM 1 and SP 1 of the Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document, UDP Policy DC1 and Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document. These policies seek to ensure that development is appropriate in scale, has regard to the character of the local area, and safeguards residential amenity.

15. The new conservatory is also contrary to Policy DP3 of the Framework. This policy requires development to respond to its context so that it integrates with and enhances its surroundings.

Planning balance and conclusion

16. I have taken account of the benefit to the appellant of the additional accommodation provided within the conservatory. However, it does not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.

17. The development therefore conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR