



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2024

by A Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/23/3336785

28 Uplands, Middleton, Manchester, M24 1FA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Paul Raw against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 23/01047/HOUS dated 22 August 2023 was refused by notice dated 7 December 2023.
 - The application is for single storey rear extension and 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension and 2 storey side extension as per application reference 23/01047/HOUS dated 22 August 2023 subject to the following conditions:
 - a) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - b) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - c) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Proposed Plans and Elevations Drg no. 44 'B' as revised 26.11.23

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the determination of this application a revised National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published in December 2023. I have therefore determined this appeal in accordance with the revised provisions within the Framework.
3. The description used in the Council's Decision Notice differs from that used on the Appellant's original application form. I consider that the description of development as used by the Appellant accurately reflects the nature of the scheme proposed and as such, I have used this description accordingly.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached mid-20th century house with hipped rosemary tiles roof and a bracketed hipped porch over a front box bay window and the property's front door. The house is constructed of red brick to its ground floor with a 'dentilled' string course dividing this red brick from the light render used to the first floor. The bay window and porch also contain what appears to be attractive original leaded lights which I also consider are notable historic features.
6. The house is located within a somewhat crescent shaped residential street where there are examples of houses of similar ages and similar semi-detached styles. To the side of the appeal property is a substation type building and a tennis club which marks a definite departure from the overriding character of the streetscene, however. To the rear the garden is long and runs alongside the tennis club separated by a screen fence on the boundary. To the adjoining neighbour's boundary an existing hedge demarks the boundary along with a shed and old conservatory style structure that extends into the rear garden from the appeal site itself.
7. The proposal before me seeks permission to create a two storey side extension so as to accommodate garage at ground floor level and two bedrooms to the first floor. To the rear, the existing conservatory building would be replaced by a single storey pitched roof extension that would protrude by a maximum of 3.5m to the rear. The property would maintain its characteristic hipped roof and would extend the line of the simple, lean too hipped roof canopy over the bay and front door so as to ensure continuity of this front elevation.
8. The main issue of contention between the parties is the perceived lack of subservience offered by the two storey element of the side extension due to it not being set back from the front elevation. The Council see this as representing poor design due to a lack of subservience being obtained as is deemed desirable by Policy 5.1 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document¹.
9. In assessing this appeal, I saw on my site visit that the potential risk of creating a terracing effect here would be largely absent due to the particular stagger of buildings on this side of Uplands. Moreover, the presence of the tennis club adjacent would also negate any such effect occurring. As such, I consider that the principal reason for seeking subservience to this site is largely absent. However, the Council take the approach that all extensions should generally appear subservient. In this case, however, were a set back to occur to this front elevation, it would disrupt the pleasing simplicity of the existing and proposed lean to porch along this front elevation.
10. Were it to disrupt this, the scheme would result in an unsightly partial stagger to this roof form that would appear much more detrimental in the streetscene than that of a flush façade as this scheme proposes. As such, I consider that the proposal would generally preserve the character of the streetscene and that, in this particular case, the harm caused by a lack of subservience would

¹ Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD Adopted June 2016. Policy 5.1 of this document states that extensions should 'generally' be subservient to the main house.

be balanced by the need to protect the integrity of these other architectural features.

11. As such the proposal would be able to meet the overriding policy requirements of DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and would represent a good design response, that would not be overly contrived to meet Policy 5.1 of the Council's SPD. As such the proposal would be a sound design response that would not undermine the character of the area and would be in conformity with the Framework as a result.

Conditions

12. The Council have sought to include the standard conditions with regards this application in order to ensure conformity with the submitted plans and to ensure materials are appropriate. As such I have included the standard conditions as outlined above.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I allow the appeal subject to the conditions outlined above.

A Graham

INSPECTOR