
Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 28 June 2021 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/21/3272404

33 Dingle Road, Middleton, Manchester, M24 1WF

- 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 Mrs Rachel McDermott against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01431/HOUS, dated 20 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable loft conversion to both sides of detached house, raise ridge of house to accommodate new loft conversion with 2 pitched roof dormers to the rear.
-

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.

Procedural Matter

3. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Accordingly, and in light of the reference made to the previous iteration of the Framework within the submitted evidence, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. In this respect, I am mindful that neither the appellant nor the Council have made any further submissions regarding the revised Framework. However, in light of this re-consultation, I am satisfied that any references made to the revised Framework within this decision would not be unreasonable to the parties.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 2 Woodford Road with particular regard to privacy.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

5. The host dwelling is prominent in the street scene due to its position at the junction of Dingle Road and Woodfield Road and is visible from several vantage points. The area is characterised by individually designed dwellings set back from the road giving an open and spacious character. Dingle Road is characterised by dwellings with hipped roofs, giving a consistent rhythm to the street scene. Whilst there is more variety of roof forms along Woodfield Road including gable forms the host property is not viewed in this context.
6. The proposal would increase the roof height by approximately a metre such that it would be higher than the existing chimneys on the dwelling and change the roof from hip to gable. There would be two dormers on the rear elevation, which whilst being sited below the ridge line would, as a result of their size and scale be a dominant feature, particularly when viewed from the side and rear.
7. The raising of the roof height and change to its design would unbalance the property with the roof becoming a dominant, bulky feature which would not reflect the character or appearance of the host property, or nearby properties in Dingle Road. As a consequence, the contribution that the extended dwelling would make to the character and appearance of the area would be eroded, and harm to the surrounding area would result because of the poorly designed roof extension.
8. My attention has been drawn to examples of extensions to other dwellings in the local area. I am unconvinced that these developments are directly comparable to the proposal before me given the different character of the properties and their locations within the street scene. In addition, I am not aware of the circumstances that led to their approval including the relevant development plan policies in place at the time. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its own merits based on the site-specific circumstances of the case.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It is therefore contrary to policies P3 and DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy (2016) which together seek to ensure, amongst other things, that developments are of a high standard of design, are well proportioned and enhance the quality of the area. It would also not comply with the Framework or the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (2016) (SPD) which have similar aims.

Living conditions

10. I note that there are differences between the parties on the distances from the proposed dormers to 2 Woodford Road. Whilst the windows in the dormers would not overlook habitable rooms of the neighbouring dwelling, due to the height of the dormer windows and the proximity of the boundary there would be overlooking from the windows into No 2's garden area which would result in a loss of privacy to users of it.

11. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 2 Woodford Road in conflict with Policies P3 and DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy (2016) which together seek to ensure, amongst other things, that developments are of a high standard of design and do not adversely affect the amenity of residents. There would also be conflict with the Framework and the SPD which seek to ensure that harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers is not caused.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and agree with the recommendation. The appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR