



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020 by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/20/3259195

4 Boardman Fold Close, Middleton M24 1PX

- 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 and Mrs Andrew and Andrea Scott against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00441/HOUS, dated 22 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side extension following demolition of existing garage, entrance porch and store as per planning approval 19/00158/FUL. This application is for retrospective planning approval for the following changes: full render to outside of building with exception of one elevation; omission of windows and doors as shown on elevations; replacement of 2 existing windows.
-

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 Matters

3. The appellant submitted an amended plan with their appeal statement; AV01_G. This plan proposes an increased amount of render and seeks to regularise works to a chimney, windows and doors carried out during construction which were not in accordance with plans approved under application 19/00158/FUL. I have been asked to determine this appeal on the basis of AV01_G rather than the refused plan, AV01_F.
4. The '*Procedural Guide – Planning Appeals – England*' advises that if an applicant thinks that amending their application proposals will overcome the local planning authority's reasons for refusal, they should normally make a fresh planning application (Annexe M.1.1). If an appeal is made, the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority, and on which interested people's views were sought (Annexe M.2.1).

5. Notwithstanding that, in deciding whether to accept these revised plans, I have given consideration to the 'Wheatcroft Principles' (Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd v SSE [JPL 1982 P37]) and whether any prejudice would occur. Third parties have not had an opportunity to comment upon AV01_G. However, this plan is largely the same as earlier versions AV01_D and AV01_E, which third parties were consulted on. It includes a slight reduction in the amount of render used compared to both AV01_D and AV01_F. Furthermore, the Council have confirmed they have no objections to my consideration of AV01_G as the basis of this appeal.
6. Accordingly, I am satisfied no party would be prejudiced by my consideration of the appeal on the basis of Plan No AV01_G and have therefore determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

7. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and local area.

Reasons

8. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, detached dwelling of dark brick construction. The property was recently extended to the side and rear. The unauthorised changes to the dimensions of the extension, fenestration and removal of a chimney stack are considered acceptable to the Council and I have no reason to disagree.
9. With a few exceptions, houses on Boardman Fold Close (BFC) are generally consistent in their external finishes, with most constructed of the same facing brick. While there are other examples of houses in BFC that have had applications of render, these are used sparingly and generally limited to first floor levels with the ground floor remaining in facing brick. The amount of render proposed would cover the front and rear elevations of the property. While I appreciate to requirement to modernise the property, this would leave little of the original brickwork visible. As a result, No.4, which has been significantly enlarged, would appear unduly prominent in the street scene.
10. I note the examples of other houses in surrounding streets which have a rendered finish. However, I have little information before me on these, with only photographs included in the evidence. From my observations, these are either of different house types or include less render than the example before me. As such, I do not consider them comparable to the proposal before me. Nor would their existence justify the harm I have identified. The appeal site's location away from any designated heritage asset does not alter my assessment in this regard.
11. To conclude, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or local area. It would therefore not be in accordance with Policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy 2016. These seek to ensure development respects context where it is positive having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general.

Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR