



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2021

by B Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/21/3283593

11 Dane Bank, Middleton, MANCHESTER M24 2RL

- 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 and Mr Emma and Carl Hartley against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01032/HOUS, dated 10 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor front and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Dane Bank is a cul-de-sac consisting of modern residential development. These consist of detached dwellings of similar design and materials. These include some variety of form with several including projecting gables, side extensions and other adaptations since their original construction. By virtue of being within a row of similar styled properties, the appeal site makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposal would extend the host dwelling to its side and front. The proposed extension would be disproportionate with the existing form and features of the dwelling. The proposal would not be subservient, nor would it integrate well with the dwelling's overall design. The ridge, of both the front and side elements, would be lower than the main dwelling. However, this would not substantially diminish the overall effect of the proposal. Therefore, whilst the proposal would replicate materials and window configuration of the host dwelling, the design would be out of keeping with the existing property.
5. The appeal dwelling is within a row of properties with a largely similar front building line. As a result, the front projection of the proposal would be prominent within the street, at odds with the more subdued character of adjacent development. Although, the proposal would have similar characteristics to 26 Dane Bank, that property is recessed from the highway and set back from No 24. Consequently, its overall impact has a limited effect on its immediate setting. In contrast, the proposed extension would be a dominant and striking addition to the streetscene.

6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for residential development¹ does not support two-storey extensions that would contribute to the terracing effect. By its proximity to the side boundary the proposal would not accord with this guidance. Furthermore, the exceptions described in the SPD would not apply in this case. The space between and above the single storey elements of No's 11 and 13 is a positive feature in the street. The gap provides some relief from built form and variety to the area. This would be substantially eroded by the proposal. Consequently, the scheme would contribute to the terracing effect, with a dominant form of development. This harmful effect would be exacerbated by the overall scale of the scheme and would not be negated by the retention of the retained gap of No 13.
7. Accordingly, the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy (2016), the Council's residential extension guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. These seek, among other matters, for development to be of high-quality design and to positively contribute to the area with well-proportioned development.
8. The proposed extension would be of acknowledged benefit to the Appellants. However, this private benefit is of limited merit in favour of the proposed development.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

B Plenty

INSPECTOR

¹ Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD 2016