The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 June 2024

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/24/3339869
102 Curzon Road, Rochdale OL11 2RX

- 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 Mr Mohammad Rizwan against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref is 23/00937/HOUS.
- The development proposed is a double storey side extension and single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is situated in a residential area characterised by two storey dwellings, both semi-detached properties and short terrace rows which are set on consistent front building lines that follow the curvature in the highway. There is variation in the design and appearance of these buildings, but the set back of properties behind front garden and parking areas, as well as the presence of open space areas around junctions, gives the area a spacious and verdant character.

4. The appeal scheme comprises of a two-storey side extension with a single storey extension to its rear and also to the rear of the existing dwelling. The two-storey element of the proposal provides a set back from the front elevation of the existing dwelling, and as such, it would be subservient to it. The development would also maintain an open space area to the side. However, the combination of the two and single storey elements of the proposal would together add significant massing that would dominate the host building and appear incongruous in this prominent corner location.

5. Reference has been made by the appellant to an extension on a neighbouring property at 129 Curzon Road. The Council has however stated that this development has not been constructed in accordance with the approved plans. In any event, from the information available, the extension at No. 129 does not comprise of a wide rear single storey element and its circumstances are not therefore comparable to the appeal before me.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building. As such, it would conflict with Policies DM1 and P3 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy which seek high quality design and development that is well proportioned. It would also be contrary to the Guidelines &and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek, amongst other matters, development that is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

7. The proposed development would not accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, that indicate that I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR