



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2024

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/24/3354122 5 Moor Hill, Rochdale, OL11 5YB

- 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 Ross Hartley and Samantha Hartley against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00478/HOUS.
 - The development proposed is two storey side, single storey rear extensions following demolition of existing detached garage. Erection of new 1.8m high timber gate and fence together with alterations to fenestration on the front and rear first floor elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension at 5 Moor Hill, Rochdale, OL11 5YB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00478/HOUS and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the original building.

Procedural Matter

2. This appeal decision focuses on the proposed two storey side extension. The Council has no objections to other elements of the proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a detached garage to the side. It is located in a residential area characterised by the presence of detached and semi-detached one and two storey dwellings, varied in style and appearance.
5. The appeal dwelling is set back from the road behind a low wall and front garden and has a driveway to the side and a garden to the rear.

6. During my site visit I noted that dwellings in the area are set back behind gardens and/or driveways and have gardens to the rear. The appeal dwelling and its neighbours to either side, Numbers 3 and 7 Moor Hill, are also set back behind a grass verge. Across the road from the pair of dwellings is a tall hedgerow, behind which is a children's nursery.
7. The above features, along with the presence of trees results in the area being notable for its green and spacious qualities.
8. During my site visit, I observed that many dwellings have been extended and/or altered, with plentiful evidence of changes to dwellings at both ground floor and roof level. The dwellings to either side of the appeal dwelling, for example, have two storey flat-roofed extensions. Changes to dwellings combine with the different style and form of dwellings in the area to result in a general absence of built uniformity.
9. Rather, it is the spacious surroundings and varied appearance of dwellings, their set back from the road and the presence of greenery that affords the area its notable attributes.
10. The proposal would involve the removal of the detached garage and would extend the dwelling to the side. The proposed width of the extension has been reduced further to amendments.
11. The proposed development would extend the hipped roof and the front porch canopy to the side. This would result in an attractive two storey addition to the side of the appeal dwelling. Unlike the flat-roofed extension to the non-matching attached dwelling, No 3, the proposed development would appear in keeping with the character of the host dwelling.
12. I find that it would result in a carefully conceived extension that would, in no way, appear dominant or non-subservient, but which would provide for additional space in a manner that respects the host dwelling's original appearance.
13. Further to the above, I note that demolition of the garage would result in the proposal retaining a spacious area of garden to the side of the dwelling. I find that this would combine with the area of garden to the side of No 7 to maintain the green and spacious qualities of the area.
14. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would not be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Core Strategy¹ Policies DM1 and P3; to Places for Everyone² Policy JP-P1; or to the Council's "Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development" Supplementary Planning Document (2016), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conditions

15. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests set out in Paragraph 55 of the Framework. A condition controlling materials is necessary in the interest of local character.

¹ Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy (2016).

² Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024).

Other Matters

16. As noted above, the applicants submitted amended plans. These plans superseded the plans originally submitted with the planning application. The permitted elevation and floor plans comprise Drawing Nos: 24.3336.SC7.2B and 24.3336.SC7.1B.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the appeal succeeds.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR