The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2019 by S Witherley BA, PGDiP, PGDiP, Cert CIH, Assoc RTPI

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 June 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/19/3226417
7 Bamford Avenue, Middleton, M24 2GE[1]

- 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 Mrs Jessie Connolly against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref 19/00111/HOUS, dated 3 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2019.
- The development proposed is described as the erection of flat roof side extensions, pitched roof rear extension, renew existing roof and removal of chimneys.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with a steep dual pitch roof with the gable forming the front elevation. Within this elevation is the front entrance and a bay window with a tiled canopy above. The property sits within a relatively narrow plot with a small front garden. Within this section of the street the properties are of a similar design, scale and form and are set on a distinct building line. The properties are positioned close together and are separated by a small gap at either side. This gap provides a welcome break between properties and contributes to the visual rhythm and uniform appearance of the streetscape. Whilst there are properties within the street with side extensions, these cover a relatively small area of a flank wall, and fundamentally, as a result of their small scale, the character of the original property, the streetscape and the space between properties is mainly retained.

5. The proposal also seeks to lower the existing bay window, construct a rear extension and remove the chimney pots. However, the proposed flat roof side extensions would be constructed to both sides of no. 7. The proposal on the

[1] The postcode is taken from section 1 to the planning application form.

southwest facing flank wall would be set back from the front elevation and run the length of the building including across the proposed rear extension. The proposal on the other side wall would cover the rear half and the proposed rear extension. Both proposals would be built up to the shared boundary.

6. The design and form of the flat roof extensions would contrast against the regularity of the steep pitch roof and would look at odds with it. This would result in two visually awkward additions to either side which would significantly detract from the character and appearance of no. 7. Despite being set back from the main elevation it would still be possible to view the additions from the street when approaching the property. The contrast in character and appearance between the flat roof additions and the steep dual pitched roof would be noticeable resulting in the existing symmetry and openness of the property and streetscape being significantly altered. As a result, the side additions would not demonstrate good quality design that enhances the area.

7. Examples of other side extension from around the area have been submitted. However, as noted, these are not directly comparable with the appeal proposal. In any event, every application should be considered upon its individual merits. The reason why the appellant needs a larger house has been noted, however, little weight can be attached to such personal circumstances.

8. Drawing all of the above points together, it is considered that the proposed side extensions would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and that of the surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposal would not seek to secure high quality design that reflects the local character and, therefore, does not comply with the Policies DM1 and P3 of The Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy, October 2016 and would also conflict with similar aims of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019, paragraph 30.

Conclusion and recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR