



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025

by **K Mansell BA (Hons) MPhil TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/25/3361552

61 Argyle Street, Heywood, Rochdale OL10 3DQ

- 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 Ms Michelle Smyth against the decision of Rochdale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01027/HOUS.
 - The development proposed is double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Argyle Street lies within an established residential area where the prevailing character is traditional brick terraced houses of broadly uniform scale and appearance. The dwellings present either a front or side elevation to the road. Those facing the street are typically set back behind modest front gardens and low boundary walls/fences, forming a reasonably consistent building line. Corner properties typically incorporate a garden to the side. These factors combine to give an order and consistency to the pattern of development along the street, which adds positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The appeal property is a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling. It fronts the highway at the junction of Argyle Street and an unadopted no-through road, which provides non-vehicular access to Unity Crescent to the rear. The proposed development would introduce a two-storey side extension on land currently laid out as a garden.
5. To the front of the house, the appeal proposal would extend to more than half the width of the host dwelling. It would not be set back from the frontage and the roof line to the extension would not sit below that of the main house. It would therefore fail to appear subservient to the host property. This would be particularly apparent in views from Argyle Street, but it would also be visible from the rear. Consequently, the extension would appear disproportionate and unsympathetic to the scale and form of the host dwelling and fail to complement its appearance. As a result, even with matching materials and detailing, it would be visually harmful.

6. The appeal proposal would occupy No 61's side garden. To accommodate the angled perimeter, it would include an awkward step-in mid-point that would extend up to the boundary. The extension would erode the present openness to the boundary and the sense of spaciousness around the host dwelling. It would also contrast to the property on the opposite corner at No 63, which maintains a similar garden to the side boundary that contributes to the open character of the area. This would be to the detriment of the reasonably consistent pattern of development along the street and the visual and spatial quality of the street scene.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies DM1, P1 and P3 of the Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy (2016) and Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024). These seek to ensure, amongst other matters, that new development is well-designed, well-proportioned and respects its surroundings. It would also conflict with guidance in the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (2016), which includes advice that side extensions to corner plots will not generally be permitted unless an adequate separation is maintained between the building and the boundary. It would further conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, which broadly promotes, amongst other matters, the importance of good design.

Other Matters

8. I have been referred to similar developments in the locality, albeit no specific examples have been cited. Nevertheless, I am required to reach conclusions based on the individual circumstances and merits of this appeal.
9. I recognise the appeal scheme may provide some practical benefits to the appellant, such as additional living space. However, personal circumstances seldom outweigh more general planning considerations, particularly where development would be permanent. I also acknowledge potential social, economic, and environmental benefits, including local employment and energy efficient construction. However, given the modest size of the appeal scheme, these benefits would be limited and would not outweigh the substantial harm that I have identified. Nor does the absence of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring properties justify development that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
10. The appellant has also alleged a lack of engagement by the Local Planning Authority to explore potential amendments to the scheme. However, this is not a matter that affects my determination of this appeal, which I must consider on its individual merits.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan, and there are no material considerations that warrant taking a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

K. Mansell

INSPECTOR