
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2017

by Matthew Birkinshaw BA(Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/17/3166757
11 Newhouse Road, Heywood, OL10 2NR

- 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 Mrs Caroline Bamford against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01333/HOUS, dated 7 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garage and construction of a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a detached property fronting onto Newhouse Road. At present it has a large, 2-storey gable projecting from the front elevation. The centrally located gable is a distinctive feature of the property and contributes positively to its character and appearance.
 4. As part of the appeal proposal the 2-storey side extension would step forward from the front elevation by roughly 2m. It would also share the same eaves and ridge height as the host property, and have a similar hipped roof to the gable. In doing so, I consider that the size, scale and forward projection of the extension would result in an unduly prominent feature that would compete with the existing 2-storey gable. Rather than complimenting the architectural style of the house, the siting and design of the extension would unbalance the front elevation and detract from one of its defining features. The proposal would represent a poor standard of design that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property.
 5. Furthermore, although the house is set back from the road and is partially screened by existing landscaping, due to the position of the driveway the extension would be clearly visible within the public domain. Its size and footprint would therefore lead to a prominent form of development. Despite the varied mix of properties nearby, the extension would also detract from the character and appearance of the immediate surrounding area.
-

6. In reaching this view I have taken into account that the adjacent property, no.13 Newhouse Road, has a similar 2-storey side extension that steps forward from the front elevation. However, based on the information provided it is not as large as the appeal proposal, which would extend beyond the front elevation by approximately 2m. No.13 also steps forward at either end of the property, creating a symmetrical appearance to the front elevation. The circumstances are therefore materially different, and the appeal scheme would not successfully relate to no.13.
7. It is also noted that a neighbouring resident supports the proposal, and states that the plans would allow the host property to be extended without reducing garden space at the rear. Although this is a benefit, it does not outweigh the harm that would be caused by such a large extension that would dominate the front elevation of the host property. Nor does the lack of any adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.
8. Finally, the appellant states that a subservient extension would make the host property stand out as different and would be inferior, with a disastrous impact both visually and financially. However, no alternative designs have been provided to enable any meaningful comparison with the appeal scheme. Similarly, no details of any financial implications have been submitted. In the absence of any further information it is not possible to attribute these comments any significant weight in reaching my decision.
9. I therefore conclude that by reason of its scale, massing and projection forward from the front elevation the proposal would represent a poor standard of design that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property, and the surrounding area. As a result, it conflicts with Policies DM1 and P3 of the *Rochdale Core Strategy* which, amongst other things, seek to ensure high standards of design in new development. For the same reasons the proposal is also contrary to one of the Core Planning Principles of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to secure high quality design.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Matthew Birkinshaw

INSPECTOR