



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2025

by **D Ellis MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/24/3354677

13 Shaftesbury Drive, Heywood, Rochdale OL10 2PH

- 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 Jan Guzej against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00298/HOUS.
 - The development proposed is described as “insulate all external walls with EPS polystyrene graphite panels of thickness 100mm. Polystyrene panels will then be finished with white silicone render.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the application form included technical details of the proposed insulation and the reasoning behind the application. As these are not development in and of themselves and in the interests of conciseness, I have removed these elements from the description of development in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The dwellings along Shaftesbury Drive and the surrounding roads are a mix of detached and semi-detached, with distinct groups of properties that are of a similar design and appearance. The appeal site is part of a group of properties on either side of the junction with Winchester Avenue which have front gable features and are finished entirely in brick. The adjacent bungalows at 15 and 17 Shaftesbury Drive and the properties on the opposite side of the road to the appeal site are also finished solely in brick. There are also groups of properties in Shaftesbury Drive and the surrounding roads where the front elevations are part-brick and part-render. The uniformity and distinctiveness of the design of the different groups of dwellings creates a pleasing architectural harmony which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed fully rendered finish would jar with the appearance of the adjacent brick properties and the part-rendered properties at 19-25 Shaftesbury Drive and 1-19 Winchester Avenue nearby. I note that 19 Newbury Grove (No 19) is fully rendered, however this property is within a group of properties where the front

elevations are mostly rendered, which enables the rendered finish at No 19 to integrate with the street scene.

6. Overall, the proposed rendered finish would fail to respect the street scene at the appeal site and would detract from the distinctiveness and cohesiveness of the different groups of properties. The proposal would therefore cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to Policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy (2016), Policy JP-P1 of the Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024). These all require, amongst other things, for development to be of a high-quality design which respects the character and context of the area.

Other Matters

7. The proposal seeks to improve the energy efficiency of the appeal property. However, the energy efficiency improvements have not been quantified, and it has not been demonstrated that these improvements are the least harmful means of achieving energy efficiency improvements at the property. As such I attach limited weight to these improvements, which would not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion

8. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

D Ellis

INSPECTOR