

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2017

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 02 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/17/3171770

84 Kingsway, Rochdale, Lancashire, OL16 4UU

- 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 Mr Mohammed Bashir Mughal against the decision of Rochdale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01536/HOUS dated 9 January 2016 was refused by notice dated 1 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension with loft, 2 No. skylights to rear roof and porch to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The first reason for refusal states that the development by virtue of the type and layout of accommodation proposed would be tantamount to a new dwelling on the site. The description of development on the application form and on the refusal notice however make reference to extensions rather than a separate dwelling. The submitted drawings, although containing a further front door and other duplicated spaces such as two kitchens, also show a link through the building between the lounges. The appellant has also confirmed that the proposal is for additional living accommodation but if the proposal was to be occupied separately, then this would require planning permission and any such application would be determined on its own merits.

Main Issue

3. I consider the main issue therefore is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling situated on a generously sized plot on the corner of Kingsway and Turf Hill Road. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and comprises of a variety of semi-detached and detached dwellings, with some bungalows. The buildings generally have a simple form with some regular features such as two storey curved bays. These characteristics, alongside the width of the highway and the setback of
-

properties behind front garden and parking areas, gives the area a pleasant and spacious character.

5. The proposal includes a two-storey extension to the eastern side of the house. With a width of around 8.7m, it would be around the same width as the existing dwelling. This, alongside the roof form of the proposal, which would extend over the existing house, would result in an addition with a significant mass and bulk. I recognise that the development would incorporate features such as the two-storey bay, which would reflect the bay on the existing dwelling. It would also maintain gardens to the rear and parking to the front. However, the large size of the proposal, which would occupy much of the side garden area, would appear unduly dominant in this corner location and significantly erode the space in the streetscene. A single storey extension on the eastern flank of the proposed two storey element is also sought, which would further add to the built development on the site and bring the property close to the Turf Hill Road boundary.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would give rise to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the area. It would conflict with Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's Core Strategy, which seek, amongst other matters, high quality design that takes the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area. It would also be contrary to the Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development SPD and Chapter 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

7. I note the appeal development is to provide accommodation to enable the care of the appellant's wife by their daughter, which has been driven by changes in social care provision and reduced financial support. The appellant has additionally stated that reducing the size of the proposal would not fulfil the reasons for it. Whilst I sympathise with the appellant on this matter, I do not consider this would justify the significant harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the host building and the area.
8. Concerns have been raised about the handling of the appeal application by the Council and the lack of contact or communication prior to the issuing of the decision. These matters have no bearing on the planning merits of the proposal before me and I can confirm that I have dealt with the appeal on its own merits.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, including comments relating to the layout of the existing house and proposed scheme, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR