
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 January 2021 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/20/3262484
23 Cleworth Road, Middleton M24 5DF

- 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 Chris Gladstone against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00614/HOUS, dated 4 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side and rear extension with single storey front extension and alterations to existing rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. This appeal relates to a resubmitted planning application and the front extension referred to in the description above is no longer included in the proposal, thus I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Reasons

5. This appeal concerns a two-storey semi-detached dwelling of similar character and appearance to the surrounding pairs of semi-detached properties in the locality. There is good spacing between most pairs of properties along Cleworth Road, and this layout gives the street scene a regular rhythm.
6. The Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD (June 2016) (the SPD) provides guidance for house extensions and advises that in order to avoid a terracing effect a two-storey side extension that would be within 1 metre of the side boundary will not normally be permitted unless it is set back a minimum of 2 metres from the front main wall of the house or, the ground

and first floor of the extension are both set back a minimum of 1 metre from the front main wall of the house.

7. The proposed two-storey side extension would be constructed almost up to the shared side boundary with 21 Cleworth Road and its front elevation would be flush with the host dwelling. The lack of set back and significant scale and mass of the extension would cause it to lack subservience, thus it would read as an overly dominant addition to the host dwelling. The proposal would also substantially erode the side space between the host dwelling and No 21, resulting in a significantly diminished gap between the two pairs of semi-detached properties.
8. Furthermore, whilst not prominent from the street scene, the chamfered corner to the rear of the proposed extension would nevertheless appear as a discordant feature which would fail to reflect the original form and design of the host dwelling.
9. It is acknowledged that No 21 occupies a set-back position to the appeal dwelling. However, the extent of the set-back is negligible and as such is not significantly apparent when viewed from within the street scene. The positioning of No 21 does not therefore negate the need to ensure the proposed extension is sufficiently set-back from the host dwelling. As such, this proposal has the potential to create a terracing effect, which would erode the established character of the wider street scene.
10. My attention has been drawn to other examples of two storey side extensions on Cleworth Road which I observed at the time of my site visit and I have taken into account. Whilst I do not have the full details of those approvals before me, I note that all were approved a considerable time ago and cannot therefore be certain they are directly comparable to this appeal. Moreover, I observed that the limited number of examples significantly erode the space to the side of the pairs of semi-detached properties, contrary to the prevailing pattern of development in this locality.
11. I am also not aware of the full circumstances of the examples at 8 Canterbury Crescent and 94 Granada Road. However, both appeal decisions indicate that there are several examples of extensions in each locality which help to define the character of the area and thus the original pattern of development has been eroded. As established by case law referred to by the appellant, I have taken each example into consideration, however for the reasons noted I do not find that they are directly comparable to this appeal and do not therefore justify this proposal.
12. Consequently, for the reasons set out, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy (October 2016) which collectively seek to ensure that developments respect their context and enhance the quality of the area. It would also fail to accord with the guidance of the SPD as noted above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hannah Ellison

Appeal Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR