



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2020

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/20/3256054

65 Bolton Road, Rochdale OL11 3NG

- 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 Asif Khan against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00219/HOUS, dated 21 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'single-storey side, two-storey side and first-storey rear extensions'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. For clarity, I have taken the description of development in the banner heading above from the application and appeal forms, inserting 'extensions' for precision and omitting unnecessary text.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The host property is a semi-detached house that is set back from the road by a notable distance, occupying a raised level when compared to the road and No 63 Bolton Road. The shared boundary between No 63 and the host dwelling currently comprises a brick wall and rail to the front of the properties with a concrete post/panel with timber infill panels between the properties.
5. The proposal seeks to erect a part single/part two storey side extension that will be located within proximity of the shared boundary with No 63. The single storey element would be located towards the front of the host dwelling with the two-storey element located towards the rear and set back by more than half the depth of the original dwelling from the existing front elevation. The proposed development would comprise an enlarged kitchen area, WC and small utility room at ground floor and a bedroom and bathroom at first floor.
6. The host dwelling has already benefitted from various extensions and alterations, including a hip to gable conversion and a rear dormer amongst other things. Whilst noting the guidance in the Council's Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document

2016 (SPD), I agree that the proposed development will not create a terracing effect and acknowledge that the SPD encourages roof designs that minimise the impact of any extension on their neighbours, such as by hipping the roof away from the neighbouring property/properties. However, the SPD also advises that extensions or alterations should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

7. I accept that the proposed development would have subordinate features incorporated within its design, such as a lower ridge line. Additionally, I do not consider that the proposed development would amount to over development of the site. Nonetheless, whilst the properties in the immediate locality of the host dwelling have hipped roofs, particularly the adjacent and adjoining properties¹, I find that the hipped roof design on the proposed development would represent an incongruous feature, as a direct consequence of the existing gable end on the host dwelling. This would be contrary to the objectives of the SPD. Whilst the host dwelling is set back from the road, I find that this would not provide sufficient mitigation to counteract this strident feature and the subsequent visual harm that would be created by the proposed development.
8. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and the character of the surrounding area. This would be contrary to the design, character and appearance aims of Policies DM1, P3 of the Council's Core Strategy 2016, the SPD and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has made reference to a number of properties located on Bolton Road in his submission. Whilst noting the presence of these properties, relatively little detail has been provided regarding the planning backgrounds to these schemes. Without such information a full and detailed comparison between these developments and the case before me cannot be easily drawn, except insofar as I was able to observe and assess the sites at my visit. In any event, the fact that other development may exist, is not a reason, on its own, to allow otherwise unacceptable development. Consequently, and for the reasons described, do not out-weigh my assessment of the main issue. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

10. Taking all matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR

¹ No 63 and No 67 Bolton Road