



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2022

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3RD February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/21/3288358

2 Rectory Street, Middleton, Manchester M24 5TN

- 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 S Lucas against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01461/HOUS, dated 7 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'side double storey extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The majority of the houses on the same section of Rectory Road as the host dwelling have not been significantly altered. This also applies to the rear of the houses located on Wood Street that face Rectory Road. These factors contribute to the balanced form and regular rhythm of development to the street. The host dwelling forms the first house on this side and section of the road and whilst it has been extended through the introduction of a single storey side extension and rear conservatory, these additions have not significantly altered its original form. It was noted on my site visit that the appeal site slightly differs from the surrounding houses through occupying a larger plot.
4. Whilst there is no specific policy objection to the principle of a residential extension, I note that the appeal scheme would extend the width of the building considerably. The host dwelling has retained a clear sense of balance and symmetry relative to the adjoining property, which accordingly contributes towards a positive feature of the wider street scene. Whilst the proposed development incorporates a lower ridge, when compared to the existing house and a set back on the front elevation at first floor, the proposed development still results in an overly wide addition to the host dwelling relative to its existing proportions.
5. Therefore, the size of the proposed development, particularly through its width, would diminish and unbalance the character and appearance of the host dwelling to the detriment of the wider street scene. Although the appeal site benefits from a larger plot, this would not provide sufficient mitigation to overcome the harmful effect of the proposed development.

6. For all of these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area. This would be contrary to the design, character and appearance aims of Policies DM1, P3 of the Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy 2016 and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

7. I have also had regard to various other matters raised by the appellant, including their need to develop a family home, no adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and the provision of 2no. off-street car parking spaces, but these do not alter my conclusions on the main issue. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own particular merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR