
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2019

by R Morgan MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/19/3232372

3 Grange Avenue, Milnrow OL16 4ET

- 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 Donna Crowley against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00287/HOUS, dated 12 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a rear two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area;
 - the living conditions of the neighbours at 1 Grange Avenue in terms of loss of light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is located within a residential area characterised by semi-detached bungalows of a simple design, set behind short front gardens. Many of the properties in the surrounding area have been extended in various ways, notably through the addition of roof dormers, including No 3 Grange Avenue (No 3) which has dormers at both front and back. Whilst dormers are a relatively common feature within the streetscene, the original pitched roof form remains clearly apparent in the majority of properties in the area.
4. The proposed two storey rear extension at No 3 would be a continuation of the existing flat roofed rear dormer, which projects from just below the ridge line. The development would extend for approximately 3 metres from the existing rear elevation of the house. Whilst the original gable end of the former bungalow would still be obvious when viewed from the side, the flat roofed addition would alter the appearance of the house significantly, appearing as a large box which would be incongruous and out of character.
5. Although it would be sited at the rear of the property, the proposed extension would be visible from between gaps in the houses in Grange Avenue and also

in longer views from surrounding streets. As a result of its height and flat roofed design, it would appear awkward and out of character within the wider area.

6. I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It fails to comply with the requirements for high quality design contained in Policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy 2016 and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
7. The Council's first reason for refusal, which relates to character and appearance, refers to the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD. However, the advice contained in the SPD on rear extensions relates to the impact on neighbours rather than character issues.

Living conditions

8. The proposed development would occupy most of the width of the property but would be set in slightly from the boundary with the adjoining property, No 1 Grange Avenue (No 1). No 1 has windows and roof lights of habitable rooms very close to the boundary. The proposed two storey extension, which would be sited in very close proximity, would feel dominant and overbearing. Furthermore, it would result in overshadowing and loss of daylight and sunlight for the occupiers of No 1.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 1 due to overbearing outlook and loss of light. As such it conflicts with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy 2016 as it relates to impacts on amenity of residents. It also fails to comply with the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD which sets out standards for the projection of rear extensions close to boundaries with neighbouring properties. Furthermore, the proposal would conflict with section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework regarding standards of amenity for existing and future users.
10. The Council's second reason for refusal refers to Policy P3 in relation to living standards but this relates more to design and character issues.

Other Matters

11. In support of their case, the appellants have directed me to nearby properties 34 Woodland Road, 20 Egremont Road and 29 Beechfield Road which have a similar original design to the appeal property and have been extended at the rear. These properties and extensions to them are slightly different to that of the appeal proposal and in any event, I am not bound by other decision of the Council and have determined this appeal on its own merits.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Rosie Morgan

INSPECTOR