The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2021

by R Morgan MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/20/3260279
21 Bentgate Street, Milnrow, Rochdale OL16 4JS

- 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 & Mrs Knowles against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref 20/00819/HOUS, dated 11 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 September 2020.
- The development proposed is a rear corner extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. When travelling along Bentgate Street from the main A640, No. 21 is the first house which fronts directly onto this side of the road. Its corner position means that the appeal property is a prominent feature in the streetscene.

4. The proposed single storey extension would occupy space at the side and rear of No. 21. The development would be well set back from the street and from some vantage points there would be screening provided by existing buildings, trees and hedges. Despite this, the open, corner location of the appeal site would mean that the extension would be clearly visible, particularly when viewed from Hawthorne Lane and its junction with Bentgate Street.

5. Owing to its corner location, No. 21 is set at an angle to the adjacent bungalows along Hawthorne Lane. The proposed development would follow the building line of those properties, but this would result in the extension jutting out from the host property at an angle, making it appear awkward and contrived. The continuation of the flat roof to form a covered area at the side of the house would make this discrepancy in building lines more obvious, further exacerbating the harm.

6. Flat roofed extensions and outbuildings are a common feature amongst similar corner properties in the vicinity, but these are generally small in scale. The extension would have a significant footprint in relation to the host property, and the resultant large expanse of flat roof would be a conspicuous feature in

the streetscene, which would be at odds with the smaller, more low key, flat roofed buildings in the surrounding area.

7. Owing to its siting and large flat roof, the extension would fail to respect the host property and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The use of matching materials, doors and windows would not be sufficient to overcome this harm.

8. The proposal would conflict with Policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy 2016, which require that all new development, including extensions, are of a high quality design which respects context. There would be further conflict with the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD 2016 (SPD), which in paragraph 5.1 requires that extensions be designed to be in keeping with the host property.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should not succeed.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR