



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 May 2021 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/21/3269648

7 Tennyson Road, Middleton, M24 2WR

- 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 Glynn Meredith against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01509/HOUS, dated 9 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a First floor rear extension with Juliet balcony and alteration of windows on ground floor 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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Tennyson Road consists of a mix of semi-detached and terraced two-storey dwellings. They are constructed with a similar design, materials and architectural features, including hipped roofs. Overall, the properties in the street have a cohesive appearance and rhythm which makes a significant contribution to the character of the street.
 5. The proposal would see the erection of a first floor above the existing single-storey rear extension. The roof of the first-floor extension would be at a much shallower angle than the existing rear extension, so much so that it would have the appearance of a flat roof. The appeal property occupies a corner plot and consequently is positioned at an angle to the street, with the side elevation of the property clearly visible from public vantage points. There are no other flat roofs visible in the street, and as such the box-like proportions of the proposed flat roof would be at odds with the existing hipped roofs and the general profile of houses within the estate. The roofline would interest awkwardly just below the eaves of the existing dwelling giving the impression of an extension that has been shoe-horned into the available headroom, with little attempt to
-

provide a sympathetic roof profile that would reflect the original design of the dwelling. Consequently, the proposal would be discordant with the appeal property and the street scene and would detract from its character and appearance.

6. My attention has been drawn to examples of extensions with flat roofs in the area. No details of any planning permissions for these examples have been submitted, so it is not clear if or when planning permission was granted of if these examples were subject to the same policy context as the proposal before me. Nevertheless, example 1 is a two-storey side extension with a flat roof, at a property on a corner plot at the junction of Dale Road and Boarshaw Road. The side extension is highly visible in the street, however there are no other two-storey extensions with flat roofs in the vicinity of this property, and as such the extension appears as an unsympathetic anomaly in the street scene. The existence of poor design elsewhere does not serve as justification for further harmful development, particularly having regard to the need to comply with current planning policies.
7. Example 2 is a single-storey flat roof garage at No 2 Valley Road and example 3 refers to flat roof rear dormers at the first- floor level of properties in Jubilee Road. The scale and nature of the garage and rear dormers differ to the appeal proposal, so they are not directly comparable to the scheme before me. Furthermore, given the distance from the appeal site to Valley Road and Jubilee Road, the garage and rear dormers have no impact on the street scene at the appeal site. Thus, none of the examples lead me to alter my conclusion and this appeal has been determined on its own merits.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene. As such the proposal would conflict with policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy (October 2016), which requires development proposals to be of a high-quality design that contributes positively to the townscape and enhances the quality of the area. The proposal would also fail to accord with the guidance in paragraph 5.1 of the Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development Sustainable Planning Document (June 2016), which states that house extensions should be in keeping with the host property.
9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR