



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2025 by S Manson DipTP

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/25/3372468

9 Greenbooth Road, Rochdale OL12 7TD

- 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 Rebecca Ashurst against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00372/HOUS.
 - The development proposed is described as a two-story side extension comprising a new kitchen / diner to the ground floor plus a third bedroom, ensuite and balcony to the first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

3. The above description reflects the original submission. I have omitted the superfluous explanatory text but taken it into account. The scheme was amended during the life of the application, including the balcony to the first floor being replaced with a Juliet version. I have considered the appeal accordingly. The main issue in which is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, end-terrace dwelling situated on a cobbled residential street, where development is confined to two blocks of terraces on one side. The terrace is defined by a consistent architectural style, featuring a gable roof, uniform widths, aligned fenestration, coordinated entrance detailing, and a cohesive use of traditional materials. These characteristics lend a strong sense of rhythm and visual harmony to the street scene, which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed side extension would occupy the area adjacent the dwelling, currently used as a car parking space and historically the site of a previous dwelling. Due to the curvature of the street at this location, the resulting design would have an unusual shape. It would, however, respect the established building lines of both terrace blocks and ensure suitable access for neighbouring occupiers. Although traditional materials dominate this side of the terrace, given the proposal's

orientation and position within the street scene, the limited use of render would not make the extension unacceptably prominent.

6. That said, the introduction of a mix of narrow vertical and horizontal windows would significantly undermine the architectural coherence of the terrace. The existing fenestration across all properties is characterised by wider openings and a consistent vertical rhythm, which contributes to the unified and harmonious appearance of the group. The proposed window design, along with the repositioning of the front door, would break this rhythm and introduce visual discord, resulting in a disjointed and inconsistent frontage.
7. Consequently, the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area and conflict with Policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy (2016), Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024), and guidance set out in the Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development, Supplementary Planning Document (2016). Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that new development is of high design quality and enhances the borough's character and identity, having regard to scale, massing, and materials.

Other Matters

8. Whilst a visiting disabled relative finds it difficult to enter through the existing doorway, this personal circumstance does not outweigh the lasting harm these alterations would cause. Nor would the personal need to create a larger family home. Especially when balanced against the importance of preserving the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding area and in the absence of evidence showing that the development could not be achieved in a less harmful way. Additionally, the resolution of any concerns over the Council's handling of the application, specifically how it was decided, are matters for the main parties and have no bearing on my assessment of the main issue for this appeal, which has been considered in the context of the site and its surroundings.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal proposals would conflict with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR