



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2025

by **Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T4210/D/25/3366684

3 Tewkesbury Drive, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0HR

- 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 Lent against the decision of Bury Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 71768.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension, two storey front extension and garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the two storey front extension.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the rear extension and garage conversion/extension and permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and conversion of existing garage to living accommodation with single storey front extension at 3 Tewkesbury Drive, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0HR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 71768, subject to the following conditions:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans insofar as they relate to the single storey rear extension and conversion of existing garage to living accommodation with single storey front extension only: GSS24079.4 502; GSS24079.4 Rev. 1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary matter

3. The Council's decision describes the proposal as 'two storey extension at front, single storey rear extension and conversion of existing garage to living accommodation with single storey front extension' and as this describes the proposal more fully, I have considered it on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a traditional, semi-detached two storey house which sits on an irregular shaped plot. It has a wide front elevation that sits below a main pitched roof. The double fronted elevation contains a centrally positioned front door with windows either side of that and two projecting gables above in the roof. A single width garage is located to the side of the property, and it appears that at some point in the past a two storey side extension with an irregular floor plan has been built that adjoins the main part of the dwelling and the garage.
6. The dwelling is located in a residential street in an area of properties that appear likely to have been built in the same period. Whilst there is some variety in the style and design of dwellings and some have been extended or altered, there are some characteristics and details that are common to many of the dwellings and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the street scene and the area. Those include overhanging eaves, steep gables and stained glass windows, all of which can be seen in the front elevation of the appeal dwelling.
7. Permission was granted earlier this year for a single storey front porch extension, a single storey rear extension and a garage conversion. The current proposal now includes a two storey extension in the same position as the approved porch on the central part of the front elevation between the two gables.
8. Its siting would distract from the existing gables, would disrupt the line of the overhanging eaves and would result in the removal of the original stained glass landing window, all of which are important features of the dwelling. The introduction of an additional, shallower gable would compete with and distract from the existing, steeper gables and their design would be at odds with those. The width of the extension would be greater than those gabled elements and as such the scale of the extension, together with its siting and design, would result in an overly dominant addition that would be clearly visible in the street scene. It would, therefore, significantly harm the character and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area.
9. I find then that the proposed development would be contrary to development plan policies EN1/2 and H2/3 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan (1997) which together seek to ensure that extensions are of a high standard and do not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character of an area.
10. I have noted that the Council has raised no objection to the rear extension and the garage conversion in this proposal which remain as approved previously and are therefore acceptable. It has not objected either to the small proposed extension to the front elevation of the garage and from what I have seen, that would be also be acceptable. Those elements would accord with the development plan policies referred to above and I shall therefore issue a split decision.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans (except for the two storey front extension) to provide certainty. A condition for matching external materials is also necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the street scene and the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed two storey front extension would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed insofar as it relates to the two storey front extension.
13. The proposed single storey rear extension and conversion of existing garage to living accommodation with single storey front extension would accord with the development plan and the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to those parts of the proposal.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR