

Shmuel Lent
3 Tewkesbury Drive
Manchester
M25 0HR
Tel: 07557981531

28th May 2025

STATEMENT OF CASE – APPELLANT

Planning Appeal: Two-Storey Front Porch Extension

Appellant: Lent Shmuel

Property Address: 3 Tewkesbury Drive, Manchester, M250HR

Planning Reference: 71768

Local Planning Authority: Bury Council

1. Introduction

This statement of case is submitted in support of an appeal against Bury Council's refusal of planning permission for a proposed two-storey front porch extension. While permission has been granted for the ground floor element, the first-floor addition was refused. The grounds for refusal primarily cite issues of scale, design, and visual impact within the street scene, referencing Policies EN1/2, H2/3 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and SPD6.

2. Response to Reasons for Refusal

The refusal states that the proposal would be "a prominent and intrusive feature in the street scene" and "seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the area."

I respectfully contest this for the following reasons:

a) Lack of Uniform Character

The area does not possess a consistent architectural character. The street scene includes properties with a wide range of extensions, porch sizes, roof alterations, and façade treatments. This visual diversity is a defining feature of the area. The attached photographic evidence (**Appendix A**) shows nearby properties with varied and prominent front-facing developments, of all shapes and sizes, no uniform character at all nor any common features.

b) Proportion and Design

The proposed first-floor addition is modest in scale and designed to align with the architectural rhythm of the existing property. It follows the same vertical lines as the approved ground floor porch, ensuring coherence. It does not project beyond the existing front building line and retains symmetry.

c) Visual Impact

While the proposal is visible, visibility does not equate to harm. The extension is proportional and visually integrated. Given the absence of a prevailing design style, the development would not disrupt the street scene but rather contribute to its established variation.

3. Other Comments / Interested Party Feedback

No objections from neighbours were recorded during the application process. No other issues—such as loss of light, overlooking, or overdevelopment—were cited. The sole issue raised was the visual impact, which has been addressed above.

4. Relevant Planning Policies and Legal Arguments

The appeal has been considered against:

- **Policy EN1/2** (Townscape and Built Design)
- **Policy H2/3** (Extensions and Alterations)
- **SPD6** (Alterations & Extensions to Residential Properties)

All of these documents support good design that respects the character of an area. However, given the character here is ***eclectic rather than uniform***, the proposal does not conflict with the intent of these policies.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) also encourages a flexible, design-led approach that recognises local context, innovation, and variety.

Conclusion and Summary

The proposed development:

- Is consistent with the diverse and evolving nature of the area
- Maintains proportion, alignment, and architectural coherence
- Does not adversely affect neighbours or the wider environment
- Complies with the broader aims of both local and national planning policy

Therefore, I respectfully request that the Planning Inspectorate allow this appeal and grant permission for the proposed development in full.