
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2020

by R Cooper BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/19/3240435

24 Apple Tree Way, Rochdale OL16 4SW

- 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 N Griffin against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00883/HOUS, dated 20 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a two storey front extension at 24 Apple Tree Way, Rochdale OL16 4SW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00883/HOUS, dated 20 August 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 following plans: Location Plan – 1:1250; No 1709/1; No 1709/2; No 1709/3; No 1709/4; and No 1709/5; and No 1709/6.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural

2. The original application form is dated 22 July 2015. However, I have also been provided with a copy of the appellant's amended certificate of ownership and declaration which is dated 20 August 2019, I have therefore used this as the date of the application above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached two storey dwelling, located to the northern side of Apple Tree Way, set back from the street by the driveway it shares with No 22. The street is characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached houses, predominantly 2-storey, with a mix of hipped and gabled roofs. Some

- properties have dormer windows to the front, whilst all houses are of a comparable age, and constructed with similar facing brick and roof materials.
5. The Council considers the appeal site to be prominent from the street, however in my view the property is relatively inconspicuous. This is because the dwelling is positioned behind the building line, set back from the road by a driveway, and the adjacent dwelling at No 22 is positioned between the appeal property and the road.
 6. Nos 22 and 24, are similar in scale and appearance, both have two storey projecting front gables. Whilst I agree that these features provide an element of unity between the two dwellings, I noted on my site visit that the gable on No 22 appear to be wider, has a higher ridge, and is more prominent given its closer proximity to the road. Furthermore, whilst these gables provide variety within the street scene, the features do not form the prevailing character and appearance of the area.
 7. The proposed two storey extension would still include a two storey gable, albeit orientated so as to face the street, which would pay tribute to the existing dwelling and the neighbouring house, as well as maintaining a variety of appearance within the area. Whilst the extension would require alterations to the roof design, its form would respect the context of the site, the gable and the roof slopes reflecting the appearance of other roofs in the vicinity of the site. Therefore, in my view the appearance of the roof would not appear at odds with the dwelling or the surrounding area.
 8. The extension would project forward of the front elevation, bringing it closer to the side elevation of No 20. The Council have raised concerns that this would result in a loss of a visual break between buildings. However, the extension would infill a gap in between the front elevation and the existing single storey garages positioned between Nos 24 and 20. As the property is set back from the road, this existing gap, and the proposed extension would not be particularly visible from the street, as the site is mostly obscured by existing dwellings, and only intermittently visible when passers-by reach the front of Nos 20 and 22. Furthermore, the existing single storey garages and the proposed roof slope would maintain an element of space between the upper floors of the properties.
 9. Whilst I acknowledge the sizable scale of the proposed extension relative to the original dwelling, and accept it would alter its overall form, in my opinion the resultant dwelling would respect the character and appearance of the area. Also, given its location and set back from the road, it would be relatively unobtrusive to passers-by, and would not appear prominent or incongruous in the street scene. Furthermore, whilst the extension would result in a predominantly brick side elevation at the first floor, this would face north, and would not be visible from the street.
 10. Overall, I find that the extension would appear unobtrusive within the context of the site. It would not have a detrimental impact on the street scene, and consequently the character and appearance of the area would not be harmed. The external walls would be constructed in brick and roofing materials would be similar to the existing. I consider the proposed materials to be acceptable, a planning condition would ensure the bricks used would match the existing, and that the roof materials are a similar colour to the existing roof.

11. Consequently, the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the area and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy 2016, which collectively seek to ensure that development is of high quality design, that respects local context and integrates within its surroundings. The proposal is also consistent with the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document 2016, and the design objectives in paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed. I have attached the standard time limit condition, and a plans condition to provide certainty. I have also attached a condition concerning external materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

R Cooper

INSPECTOR