

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 August 2017

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) MCD DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 08 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/17/3178548

31 Stonie Heyes Avenue, Rochdale OL12 9XA

- 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 Nahila Bibi against the decision of Rochdale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00163/HOUS, dated 19 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with front dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a mid terraced house in a row that overlooks a grassed open area. From the road the house is in an elevated position and so a front dormer extension would be very prominent. This particular row of terraced houses does not have front dormer extensions although there are a number of dormer extensions in the area.
4. Core Strategy policies DM1 and P3¹ establish that new development should be of a high standard of design which reflects the promotion of good design in the National Planning Policy Framework². The Council's SPD³ sets out specific guidance for dormer extensions and indicates that dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted. It then sets out a number of design principles.
5. The proposed dormer would be on the front of the house and it would have a flat roof at the height of the existing ridge. Given that this row of houses overlooking the open space remains free from front dormers, the break in the

¹ Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy October 2016.

² Department for Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012 (the Framework).

³ Rochdale Borough Council Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development SPD, Adopted June 2016.

roof plane by the insertion of a fairly large flat roofed dormer would appear incongruous, prominent and visually intrusive. Whilst dormer extensions exist in the area, in this particular location I consider that the presence of other, unsympathetic dormers does not justify allowing another one.

6. I have considered all other matters raised but none alters my conclusion. I conclude that the proposed dormer extension would conflict with policies DM1 and P3, the Framework and the SPD. It would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and therefore the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR