

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2024

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/24/3353076

15 Bonscale Crescent, Middleton, Rochdale, M24 5LX

- 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 Mrs Zakia Salman against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00647/HOUS.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey end-of-terrace dwelling. It is located in a residential area largely characterised by the presence of two storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings.
 4. Dwellings are set back from the road behind gardens and/or parking areas and have longer gardens to the rear.
 5. During my site visit, I observed that the presence of hedgerows, gardens and grass verges provides for a sense of spaciousness and greenery. I also noted that the similar appearance of dwellings resulting from, amongst other things, similarities in design, fenestration and materials, including the common use of tile and rendering, presents the area with a strong and attractive sense of uniformity.
 6. In this latter regard, I also draw attention to the common build line to the front terraced rows including and close to the appeal dwelling. Other than small projecting canopies above front doors, there are very few examples of built development projecting forwards of the front elevations of dwellings. This is a factor that makes a notable positive contribution to the area's attractive sense of uniformity.
-

7. The proposed front extension would comprise a tall and bulky addition. It would project some considerable distance to the front of appeal dwelling. In this way, it would dominate the front of the appeal dwelling to the extent that it would appear as a large and disproportionate addition.
8. The harm arising from the above would be exacerbated as a consequence of the proposal drawing undue attention to itself as an incongruous feature, out of keeping with its surroundings. The large forward projecting porch would appear at odds with the rest of the terrace and with other dwellings close to the appeal property, which are notable for their sense of uniformity derived in part from the general absence of large, bulky porches.
9. Given this, I find that the proposed development would severely disrupt the area's attractive sense of uniformity.
10. Taking all of the above into account, I consider that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Core Strategy¹ Policies DM1 and P3; to Places for Everyone² Policy JP-P1; and to the Council's "Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development" Supplementary Planning Document (2016), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

11. In support of the proposed development, the appellant draws attention to the fact that it would provide for the important provision of a downstairs toilet. Whilst I note and support such provision, I am also mindful that the Council has suggested alternative ways in which a downstairs toilet might be provided.
12. In this regard and in the absence of any substantive evidence, it is not clear to me that the proposed development is the only way in which a downstairs toilet might appropriately be provided. The proposed development would result in harm and hence the conclusion below.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

¹ Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy (2016).

² Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024).