



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2020

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/19/3241900

11 Ullswater Grove, Heywood OL10 2BL

- 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 Duncan Cooper against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00719/HOUS, dated 24 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 06 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two storey rear extension following demolition of existing single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for the erection of two storey rear extension following demolition of existing single storey extension at 11 Ullswater Grove, Heywood OL10 2BL, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00719/HOUS, dated 24 June 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Site Plan, January 2019; and Proposed Plans and Elevations, Revision No. B, dated May 2019.
 - 3) The bricks to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) No development within the area illustrated as cladding on the drawing Proposed Plans and Elevations, dated May 2019, Revision No. B, shall take place until samples of the external timber cladding facing materials have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The relevant works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved sample details.

Procedural Matter

2. The proposed development is described in the application form as "Building a two storey extension to the rear of an existing domestic property. The extension will extend 3m from the existing rear wall (Once existing conservatory and former 'coal shed' have been removed) and will be the full

width of the property (7.72m)". However, in the interests of clarity I have adopted the description of the development from the decision notice.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effects of the proposed development on:
 - i) The character and appearance of the host property and the area; and
 - ii) The living conditions of the occupiers of 13 Ullswater Grove, with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. No 11 is a 2 storey semi-detached property in a residential area. It is part of a wider group of semi-detached and terraced properties set back from the street on staggered building lines. Properties are constructed in matching styles and materials and with simple roofscapes. Front gardens are separated from the street and from one another by low fences and hedgerows. The similar and unassuming properties result in a consistent and harmonious character and appearance to the street scene.
5. On the basis of the evidence before me, properties along Ullswater Grove and Grasmere Avenue to the rear were constructed with modest single storey rear extensions. However, properties have been variously extended over time resulting in a mix of single and 2 storey rear extensions in a range of sizes and styles. In this respect, No 11 has 2 non-matching flat roof single storey extensions to the rear.
6. The proposed full width 2 storey extension would project approximately 3 metres from the rear elevation of the host property. It would have a dual pitched roof set slightly below the ridgeline of No 11. The ground floor would be finished in matching brick with timber cladding to the first floor.
7. While the proposal would obscure the rear elevation of the host property, the existing elevation has no particular architectural merit and the existing extensions do not make a positive contribution to the dwelling or to the townscape. Moreover, the size and scale of the proposal would be in keeping with the 2 storey extension to the rear of the attached property. Therefore, in this respect, the proposal would maintain and enhance the quality of the area.
8. Although sited to the rear of the property, the staggered building lines would afford oblique views of the side elevation of the extension from limited locations at the end of the cul-de-sac. Consequently, a small area of timber cladding to the first floor side elevation would be visible from Ullswater Grove. I accept that the timber cladding would not match the materials of the host property. However, as a result of the limited views and tree screening, the small extent of cladding that would be visible would not be prominent or discordant in the street scene.
9. Moreover, while it might be novel in the immediate setting, timber cladding is characteristic of the wider area, being used to varying extents within groups of properties including on nearby Walton Street. Therefore, as a result of the repeating use of building materials, the proposal would not appear exceptional

in the wider context. Consequently, although it would be noticeable, the timber cladding would not result in significant adverse visual effects in this location.

10. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property or the area. It would accord with the visual amenity and design aims of Policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy Adopted October 2016 (the CS). It would not conflict with the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD Adopted June 2016 in relation to extensions. It would accord with policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that require development to add to the quality of the area and to create attractive and distinctive places.

Living conditions

11. The attached property, No 9, has a 2 storey rear extension immediately adjacent to the appeal property. There are no windows in the side elevation facing the appeal property and the proposal would not extend beyond the neighbouring extension. Consequently, the proposal would not result in adverse impacts on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 9.
12. The neighbouring property to the other side, No 13, lies at the turning head of the cul-de-sac and it is set back behind the building line of the appeal property. As a result, the proposal would not project beyond the rear building line of No 13. Therefore, it would not result in impacts on the rear-facing windows or the rear garden of No 13.
13. The proposal would be visible from the window in the side elevation of No 13. Although this is a relatively small window fitted with blinds, the evidence indicates that it is the principal window of a habitable room. The proposal would be within 5m of the window and it would be substantially taller than the existing single storey extension to the rear of No 11. However, given the relative siting and orientation of the dwellings, the proposal would not result in any significant overshadowing or loss of sunlight to the habitable room window.
14. The view from the neighbouring window will include the 2 storey side elevation of No 11 and its single storey rear extension, the 2 storey rear extension to No 9 and the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties. Although the proposal would approach the neighbouring property more closely, it would not be significantly deeper than the existing rear extension and it would not extend across the neighbouring side window. The increased bulk of development would be conspicuous. However, it would not obscure the views past the rear of No 11 and across the gardens towards Walton Street. Therefore, the proposal would not significantly diminish the outlook from the window of No 13.
15. Therefore, I find that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 13, with particular regard to loss of light and outlook. It would not conflict with the residential amenity aims of Policies DM1 and P3 of the CS, the SPD or the Framework.

Conditions

16. In the event that the appeal was allowed, the Council has suggested planning conditions. I have assessed these against the tests set out in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

17. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission, I have also specified the approved plans in the interests of certainty. A condition specifying the materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the appeal property.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions, for the erection of two storey rear extension following demolition of existing single storey extension.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR