



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2024

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/23/3335600

8 Leighton Avenue, Middleton, Manchester M24 1PJ

- 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 Joe Pritchard against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 23/00914/HOUS dated 15 August 2023 was refused by notice dated 17 October 2023.
 - The application is for single storey pitched roof side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the determination of this application a revised National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published in December 2023. I have therefore determined this appeal in accordance with the revised provisions within the Framework.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a modern semi detached house spread over three floors with the top room being located within the roof slope and served by a small front dormer window. The house is synonymous within its adjoining neighbour albeit being 'handed' so that the two front doors are adjacent and the ground floor study windows of each are opposite each other. This design styling together with the arched neo classical porch canopy gives the appeal property and its neighbour, a little more architectural flamboyance than would be usual in such a new development.
5. The appeal site occupies the end of this frontage row of houses into which the development is accessed. The rest of the development is formed of quite a tight knit collection of houses of a similar style. This frontage forms the appeal house and its neighbour followed by linked garages so as to create a more traditional feel to the estate. To the rear of the property there is a walled back garden with a lean too structure of some kind protruding over. The non

adopted highway adjacent has also seen some seemingly informal use as amenity space for residents whereby seats and a small shed have been constructed within the space for the benefit of those who live here.

6. The proposal before me seeks permission to extend the existing house into the cul de sac that runs alongside it with a single storey, pitched roof side extension so as to accommodate a ground floor en suite bedroom.
7. The cul de sac within which the house sits forms something of a courtyard whose informality is reinforced by the both the informal use of the areas around it and the block paving surface material. Ancillary landscape in the form of low bushes also contributes to making this area an attractive space that seems well used by residents. The site of the extension by account once contained such ancillary landscape planting but has now been dug to create a foundation for this proposal.
8. In assessing this appeal I am aware of the Council's policy DM1 which seeks to ensure visually attractive design that is responsive to context. These policy objectives are echoed within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Design and also echo those of The Framework itself.
9. In this case the proposal would further enclose this already rather modest courtyard and would introduce a small, rather contrived building into an area where there was once landscaping. It would also erode the defined 'end stop' as it is currently created by the gable end of the appeal property and would bring built development noticeably closer to those properties who face directly onto this space.
10. Although the proposed set back and traditional design of the scheme would enable it to largely integrate architecturally, the siting and location, along with the tight spaces involved, would ultimately cause some harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such the original layout of the development and the careful laying out of space here would be eroded to the detriment of the place as a whole.
11. As such, and on balance, I consider that the proposal would cause such harm to the character of the area so as to bring it into conflict with the criteria contained within Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy as well as the aspirations for good design as required by The Framework. As such this appeal must fail.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR