



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2025

by N Duff BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/25/3361095

163 Leander Drive, Rochdale OL11 2XE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1 Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Awat & Sozyar Abdullah Salih against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01000/CAA.
 - The development proposed is additional storey to a bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse consisting of the construction of (a) up to two additional storeys, where the existing dwellinghouse consists of two or more storeys; or (b) one additional storey, where the existing dwellinghouse consists of one storey, immediately above the topmost storey of the dwellinghouse, together with any engineering operations reasonably necessary for the purpose of that construction subject to limitations and conditions.
3. Paragraph AA.2(3)(a) of Class AA of the GPDO requires prior approval to be sought for the matters listed in that paragraph. There is no dispute regarding matters in paragraphs AA.1, AA.2.(3)(a)(i), (iii) or (iv). The only area of dispute is in relation to paragraph AA.2(3)(ii) which requires the prior approval of the local planning authority in relation to the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, including the design and architectural features of (aa) the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, and (bb) any side elevation of the dwellinghouse that fronts a highway.
4. The Council has cited a number of development plan policies in their reason for refusal, I have taken these into account insofar as they relate to my consideration of the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, however as this is a prior approval appeal where deemed permission has already been granted by the GPDO they in themselves are not determinative in this case.

Main Issue

5. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

Reasons

6. The property is a single storey bungalow, the building is roughly rectangular in shape with a wide frontage and has expansive hipped roof and is set in a large plot. The property has wooded areas to the rear and green open space to one side with residential development in the form of a two storey dwellinghouse to the other side. The property fronts onto Leander Drive, in a prominent position on the curve of the road, which in the immediate vicinity is comprised of modest two storey detached dwellinghouses, including opposite the site. Many of which have been altered, nevertheless, the rhythm of properties is fairly consistent along Leander Drive with the appeal dwellinghouse being generally inconsistent in terms of design and form.
7. The proposal would see an additional storey atop the bungalow resulting in a large two storey property with a wide frontage. The building would have a glazed section to its centre. The height of the building would be no greater than the immediate neighbouring property, as the floor level of the existing bungalow is lower than the road.
8. However, the width of the front elevation of the property would be significant, and much greater than that of neighbouring properties to the side or opposite, which are consistent in their form and have narrow frontages. Notwithstanding the gap between the appeal property and its immediate neighbouring property at 165 along with the garage remaining single storey, the increase in height of the building would see a significantly bulkier property with an expansive hipped roof, and due to the prominent position of the property, the bulk and mass of the property would appear discordant in the street scene and would be at odds with the character of the surrounding development. This would be especially so, given the prominence of the property on the curve in the road, where it would be conspicuous from the side and front, and from the west across the green space which includes mature trees.
9. Having regard to the detailed design and architectural features of the proposed dwelling, a matter of dispute is the central glazed area, which the Council states gives a vertical emphasis. I find that the central glazed area and proposed materials in isolation would not be harmful to the external appearance of the dwellinghouse. Nevertheless, this architectural feature would not be sympathetic to the street context and would fundamentally alter the architectural configuration of the property relative to surrounding development. I find therefore that this, in combination with the size of the proposed building would fail to accord with design policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. Given the substantial bulk and mass of the proposed development, and the consequent effect it would have on the character of the street scene, I conclude that the proposal would result in an unacceptably harmful effect on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, with particular regard to its surroundings and accordingly prior approval should be refused.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has stated that the proposal would result in the provision of a good quality family home in an accessible location, whilst the proposal would provide one large family home, this is not a factor that can be considered in the context of an application for prior approval, as the matters for consideration are restricted to those set out in Paragraph AA.2(3)(a) of Class AA of the GPDO.
12. I have been provided with an appeal decision for the site which allowed a development for three dwellings. This scheme differs from the proposal before me, as it was indicatively proposed to be a layout that would reflect the existing characteristics of the area. Therefore, this matter does not affect the decision reached in this case.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Duff

INSPECTOR