



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2025

by **S Burch BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/24/3357627

40 Kirkstall Road, Middleton, Lancs, M24 6EX

- 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 Peter Featherstone against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00892/HOUS.
 - The development proposed is for an extension to the front elevation to form a garage and car space to the front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. There have been changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) since the determination of the planning application. Having reviewed them, I am satisfied that as far as their substance relates to the main issue in the appeal, further consultation with the main parties would not be necessary since they have not materially affected or prejudiced the cases of the parties. I have proceeded on this basis, with reference to the 2024 version of the Framework

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey mid terrace dwelling located in a residential area of Middleton. The property faces the highway and there is a small front garden area. Surrounding development generally comprises of dwellings of a similar size and style. Whilst some small front porches are evident along Kirkstall Road, there is generally a high degree of uniformity in building lines and a regular rhythm of development which contributes to the character of the area.
5. The proposed development would result in the creation of a single storey front extension to form a garage. The proposed extension would comprise a substantial enlargement to the front elevation. As a result of its projection, the proposed extension would significantly disrupt the relatively uniform building line evident along the street. It would therefore also disrupt the symmetry and rhythm of development which characterises the street scene. For the reasons given above, the scheme would be at odds with surrounding development.

6. The proposed re-positioning of the front door and the addition of the garage door to the front elevation would also be at odds with surrounding development, where dwellings are generally of a simple front elevation design. This, coupled with the scale of the extension, would result in the creation of an unduly prominent addition which would dominate the host dwelling.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of other front extensions within the area, including on Kirkstall Road and Whalley Road. The address listed reads 8 Kirkstall Road however on my site visit it was evident that the property in the image submitted is 6 Kirkstall Road. Whilst this property does have a front porch, it is of a much smaller scale than the proposal and the visual impact is therefore less than the proposal. This scheme is therefore not directly comparable to the appeal proposal and reference to this property has not altered my assessment of this issue.
8. The appellant has also made reference to the front extension at 19 Whalley Road. Again, whilst I do acknowledge the presence of a front extension on this property, the street scene along this road is much more varied, with less uniformity than Kirkstall Road. This extension is therefore materially different to the appeal proposal. As a result, the two are not directly comparable and reference to this property has not altered my assessment of this issue.
9. I note that neither party raise any concerns relating to the effect of the proposed parking space on the character and appearance of the area. I do not consider the development to be problematic in this regard.
10. For the reasons outlined above, I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would have an unacceptably harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The proposal is contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy (2016) and policy JP- P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document for Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan 2022 to 2039. These policies seek to ensure that new development respects local character. It would be contrary to supplementary planning document, Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development (SPD) (2016) which highlights that proposals should be in keeping with the host property. The proposal would also conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

11. I note that the purpose of the garage is to house a quad bike for security. Whilst this is acknowledged, this does not justify the need for a front extension of this scale and does outweigh the harm that I have found.
12. The appellant has explained that they are willing to reduce the size of the proposed extension. However, it is not the purpose of an appeal to evolve a scheme, and I am required to determine the appeal on the basis of the submitted drawings.
13. They have made reference to a scheme which they state would be permitted development. The described scheme would reduce the size of the garage. Whilst I do not have further details of this scheme, a reduced scale is likely to have a lesser impact on the street scene than the proposal. Nonetheless, it is open to the

appellant to apply to have the matter determined under Sections 191 or 192 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Any such determination would be unaffected by the outcome of this appeal. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis of what is proposed and its consequent effects.

14. The scheme would have no impact upon habitat or open spaces. This is however a neutral factor and does not weigh in favour of the appeal.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S Burch

INSPECTOR