



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T4210/W/25/3365662

21 Philips Drive, Whitefield, Manchester M45 7PY

- 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 Lee Hoppley against the decision of the Bury Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 71222.
 - The development proposed is described as First Floor Extension onto Existing Porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, I saw that an extension above the porch was in situ. Whilst the application form states works have been completed and the proposal has been submitted retrospectively the plan submitted details a different roof form and materials; I have dealt with the appeal on this basis of the plan submitted.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is within a predominantly residential area which has various forms and designs of residential properties. The appeal property is a modest two storey end terraced property. Each property in the terrace has a small-scale flat roof porch at ground floor.
5. The appeal site is accessed via a set of steps and set at a higher floor level than the terraced three storey properties and road to the southeast. The façade of the terrace the appeal property is located is set forward from that of the terrace to the southeast. The extension is located on the elevation which faces flats on Linksvie Court. I observed during my site visit that the appeal property is clearly visible from multiple public vantage points.
6. Philips Drive contains different styles and designs of properties, however properties which share commonality in terms of features are located within distinct parts of the street creating architectural harmony this adds to the character and appearance of

the area. The uniformity of the appeal terrace façade is noticeably part of the character of area and the extension as built was obvious in the streetscene.

7. The extension in its current form is a dominant addition and incongruous to the property and streetscene. Whilst the appellant has proposed to render the extension and change the flat roof to a pitched roof this would not alter its prominence.
8. I note that an appeal for a similar development, albeit different roof form was dismissed in August 2024¹. I have taken into account the previous Inspectors findings and I do not disagree with them. I find that the development harms the character and appearance of the area.
9. There is conflict with Policies H2/3 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan (1997) which amongst other things seeks to ensure developments are of a high standard and sympathetic to the host property and surrounding area.
10. There is also conflict with Supplementary Planning Document 6 - Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties (2004, updated 2010) which amongst other things seeks to ensure developments respect the character of host properties and the streetscene.

Other Matters

11. The appellant confirms two properties on Phillips Drive have been granted planning permission for development. The information I have been provided with to compare these with the appeal proposal is limited. Nevertheless, during my site visit I did not observe any comparable extensions to the one before me, or ones which looked incongruous to the area.
12. My attention has been drawn by the appellant to other developments approved by the Council. Whilst photographs have been provided, they are not comparable to the development before me. The properties and street context for each of these extensions appear different from the appeal site context. Photographs have also been provided relating to contrasting styles not conforming to existing open streetscenes. These are also not similar to the proposed before me. Notwithstanding this each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.
13. The appellant has highlighted that the development is required due to personal circumstances in terms of medical need. I have not been provided with evidence to substantiate this. I have also not been provided with evidence to demonstrate that the development would be the only way to fulfil any need of the appellant.
14. I understand that neighbouring occupants have not objected to the development, nevertheless this does not outweigh the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the area.
15. The appellant raises concern relating to the process surrounding the erection of the extension, particularly in relation to advice given and makes accusations that the Council has in some way failed to act fairly. I have no substantive evidence to support this claim and based on my findings I agree with the Council's decision.

¹ APP/T4210/W/24/3339608

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR