



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2017

by S R G Baird BA(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31st October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/17/3180269
118 Walton Street, Heywood OL10 2DR

- 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 L Healey against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00341/HOUS, dated 24 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a 2-storey, wrap around, extension, with a detached single garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The effect on the character and appearance of the area and the implications for neighbour's living conditions with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. No. 118 is located on a corner plot in an area of mostly detached houses. Although there is a mix of house styles there is a noticeable degree of consistency in terms of finishing materials and dwelling size resulting in a mature and attractive feel to the area. Development plan¹ policies P3 and DM1 seek to ensure development of a high standard of design to ensure that buildings contribute positively to the townscape and are well proportioned. The Council has adopted supplementary guidance² for residential extensions, which should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally subservient to it. The guidance highlights that extensions to houses on corner plots can have an unacceptable impact on the street scene by eroding the space around the building and presenting a hard edge to the highway. Permission would not normally be granted for an extension to a house on a corner plot unless it would maintain sufficient space between the boundary with the highway and the nearest part of the extension. One factor taken into consideration in determining whether sufficient space is retained is whether the extension would breach a strong building line.
4. Here, the Council considers that the front elevations of dwellings on the western side of St Andrew's Drive and the main side elevation of No. 118 form a strong building line. I disagree; because St Andrew's Drive curves, only 2 of the

¹ Rochdale Core Strategy Adopted October 2016.

² Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document Adopted June 2016.

properties on this street have their front elevation in line. In this context the line drawn by the Council is contrived. The gap between the existing side elevation of No. 118 and the back of the pavement on St Andrew's Drive is substantial. Although the proposed side extension would project some 4m from the main side elevation a substantial gap to the back of the pavement would be retained on this side of the house. There is an identifiable strong building line on Walton Street and whilst the full height glazed porch would project beyond this line, the degree of projection would be slight and the glazed nature of the porch would appear light.

5. The 2-storey extension would be L-shaped and substantial. The size and position of most of the windows would be changed and the elevations would be white rendered. In this context rather than the resultant dwelling appearing as an extended dwelling it would effectively be a completely new building. As such the objective that the extension should be in keeping with and subservient to the host building is, in this case, redundant.
6. Whilst some elements of the proposal would not be inconsistent with the supplementary guidance, the scale, massing and appearance of this substantial dwelling would appear incongruous in the context of the scale and appearance of the surrounding area. Whilst the front and rear elevations would display some symmetry in terms of the position and proportion of wall to window, the same cannot be said for the west facing elevation. This full height elevation with its twin gables and the positioning of the windows and the proportion of wall to window would appear unacceptably obtrusive which would be exacerbated by the prominent corner location.
7. Drawing this together, the resultant scale, mass and finish of the proposed works would result in a dwelling that was obtrusive and incongruous in this settled street scene. As such, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of Walton Street and conflict with the objectives of development plan Policies P3 and DM1.

Neighbour's Living Conditions

8. Policy DM1 seeks to ensure that development does not have an unacceptable effect on neighbours. The proposal includes the erection of a detached garage abutting the common boundary with No. 1 St Andrew's Drive. No. 1 is at a slightly lower level and on the ground floor side elevation has a secondary window about 1m from the common boundary serving what appears to be a living room/dining room. The garage would replace an existing shed and given the secondary nature of the window, there would be no material loss of daylight/sunlight to this room or that the garage would appear dominant or overbearing. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with that part of Policy DM1.

Conclusions

9. Notwithstanding the conclusion in relation to the impact on neighbour's living conditions, the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to the objectives of the development plan as a whole. For these reasons and having taken all other matters into consideration I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

George Baird

Inspector