



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2021

by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/21/3280213

17 Pennine Drive, Milnrow, Rochdale OL16 3DT

- 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/Dr Carl Eaton against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00717/HOUS, dated 21 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2021.
 - The development proposed was described as: dormer within existing dwelling and rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a side dormer extension with installation of rooflights at 17 Pennine Drive, Milnrow, Rochdale OL16 3DT in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/00717/HOUS, dated 21 May 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: OL16 DR00 B (Site & Location Plans), OL16 DR02 H (Proposed Planning) and OL16 DR04 B (Proposed Site Plan).
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan OL16 DR02 H (Proposed Planning).

Preliminary Matters

2. The site address in the heading above, and in the formal decision, has been taken from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form as it is more precise than that given on the application form.
3. The development for which planning permission is sought was described on the application form as a "dormer within existing dwelling and rooflights". The Council's decision notice and the appeal form described the development as a "side dormer extension with installation of rooflights". In the formal decision I have used this description as it is a more precise and accurate reflection of the proposed development for which permission is sought.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal dwelling is a detached bungalow located within a residential area. It is a rendered dwelling containing white fenestration.
6. The proposed flat roof dormer would match the render of the existing walls and would align with the apex of the roof. It would not centrally align with the existing building and the windows would not be symmetrical to the current fenestration. Therefore, the scheme would conflict with the principles set out within the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD (2016) (SPD). The SPD states that it is accepted that there may be circumstances that justify a relaxation of these guidelines¹.
7. Since the application was determined, an application for a certificate of lawfulness has been granted for a side dormer extension similar to that proposed². Based on the evidence before me, there would be a reasonable prospect that the fallback position would be built if the appeal is dismissed. I give significant weight to this granted application.
8. On my site visit I observed that dormer windows were a common feature within the local area. Their design, scale and materials varied. I also noted that a number of dwellings had dormers to one side which were white with an asymmetrical fenestration and off-centre alignment. I observed that there were numerous examples of large, prominent dormers within the surrounding area which were not below the ridge line and had flat roofs.
9. The proposed dormer would add a substantial amount of scale and massing to the dwelling which would be visible from public vantage points. Nonetheless, the scale, design and materials of the dormer would not be out of keeping with the diverse range of dormers within the surrounding area. Having regard to the fallback position and dormers within the vicinity of the site, the proposed development would respect the character and appearance of dwellings within the wider area. Consequently, it would not be overly dominant due to the context of the surrounding area.
10. Whilst the scheme would not fully accord with the advice within the SPD, each application must be determined on its own merits. I conclude that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Accordingly, it would comply with Policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy (2016). These seek, amongst other matters, to ensure development proposals are of a high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area. It would also not conflict with chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires new development to be sympathetic to local character.

¹ Paragraph 5.18

² LPA reference 21/01103/CPL

Conditions

11. It is necessary to attach a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition is also necessary to ensure that the proposed materials are implemented in order to preserve the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed subject to the attached conditions.

L M Wilson

INSPECTOR