
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2019

by C Coyne BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/19/3232978

9 Tennyson Road, Middleton, Manchester M24 2WR

- 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 Byron Wood against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00222/HOUS, dated 26 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a part two storey and part single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part two storey and part single storey side extension at 9 Tennyson Road, Middleton, Manchester M24 2WR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00222/HOUS, dated 26 February 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. I have used the description of the proposal from the decision notice issued by the Council. It adequately and simply describes the proposed development instead of the slightly longer description given on the application form.
3. The decision notice issued by the Council also states the date of the application to be the 27 February 2019. On the application form the declaration signed by the applicant is dated the 26 February 2016. This would appear to be an obvious error as the land ownership declaration on the form is clearly dated the 26 February 2019. I have therefore taken the date of the application to be the 26 February 2019.
4. The decision notice issued by the Council also refers to Rochdale Core Strategy Policy PF. There is no policy with this reference within the adopted Core Strategy and this would appear to be a typographical error. Based on the planning officer's report I have taken this policy reference to be Policy P3 – 'Improving design of new development'.

5. There is a discrepancy in the proposed plans whereby an existing first floor window in the side elevation is shown to be retained on the proposed elevation plan but removed on the proposed first floor plan. Even if the existing window is to be removed, I am satisfied that this is a very minor difference, which in the circumstances of this case is not significant to my consideration of the character and appearance matters raised in the main issue in this appeal.

Main Issue

6. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

7. The appeal site is situated to the side of a two storey semi-detached dwelling. The surrounding area is predominately residential, comprising two storey dwellings within a suburban setting. The appeal property is on a corner plot with terraces of two storey dwellings running perpendicular to the boundary. The dwellings on the corner plot are set at an angle of approximately 45 degrees to the adjacent dwellings meaning that they do not continue the same building line as the terraces.
8. Policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) require all new developments to adhere to high design standards. This approach is supported by the 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). In relation to side extensions to dwellings on a corner plot the SPD states that planning permission would not normally be granted for these types of extensions as they would present a 'hard edge to the public highway'.
9. An exception to this would be if the extension maintains 'sufficient space between the boundary and the nearest part of the extension'. Factors that can be taken into account when determining what constitutes 'sufficient space' include: the need to protect an existing strong building line; the space surrounding neighbouring buildings; and the contribution that this space makes to the overall character of the street scene and surrounding area.
10. The proposed side extension would not project further than the existing building line of the terraced dwellings to the north. Additionally, given the design of the proposal and its location and orientation in relation to the adjacent terraced dwellings, I do not consider that it would present a harder edge to the public highway than currently exists. Furthermore, the proposed development would maintain sufficient space between the boundary and the nearest part of the extension thereby meeting the exceptional criteria for a side extension on a corner plot set out in the SPD.
11. The proposed ridge height would be consistent with the SPD as it would be set notably lower than the main ridge, thus ensuring that the extension would be subservient to the host property in that respect. In addition, the proposed window detailing would be in keeping with the general style and scale of windows in the wider street scene.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policies DM1 and P3 of the CS (adopted October 2016) as supported by the SPD. I also find no conflict with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which

seeks to secure high quality design which takes account of the local character and reflect the local surroundings and materials.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interest of certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring the external materials used in the construction of the extension to match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Coyne

INSPECTOR