



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2022

by P. D. Biggers BSc Hons MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15TH March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/22/3290272
57 Rose Avenue, Littleborough OL15 8QJ.

- 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 Peter Foster against the decision of Rochdale Borough Council.
 - The application 21/01189/HOUS, dated 10 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and front porch following demolition of existing attached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings on Rose Avenue.

Reasons

3. The appeal site sits on the north side of Rose Avenue which forms part of a residential estate of two storey, semi-detached houses built in brick and tile. The design of the houses in the estate has a uniformity where the first floor accommodation is largely contained within the roof pitch facilitated by the use of large strip dormers to the front and rear of the properties.
4. I have been referred to the fact that a number of properties in nearby locations have two storey side extensions in a variety of styles which the appellant considers justifies allowing the appeal. However, having taken the opportunity to walk around the nearby streets and along Rose Avenue itself on the site visit, the few properties that have been extended with a two storey side extension tend to have adopted the same roof pitch and format as the main house, in some cases continuing the strip dormer feature onto the extension. None of them have been extended in the manner proposed on the appeal site. I therefore do not consider that other cases are similar to the appeal proposal and I will determine it on its own merits.
5. The proposal would involve 3 main elements – the two storey, side extension, the construction of a porch on the frontage and the first floor, rear single storey extension.
6. Regarding the side extension I have been invited to conclude that because the extension would be set back from the frontage, in matching materials and the fenestration would align with that of the main house that it would be both subservient and in keeping with the original house.

7. I accept that the setting back of the side extension would avoid a terracing effect in views along the street and would introduce some subservience. However, in designing the extension to be the full height to the main ridge it would result in an extension with a full two storeys with a substantially higher eaves level rather than a dormered upper storey. Not only would this result in an awkward addition out of keeping with the main house design but it would also result in an asymmetrical extension entirely out of character with the design of the semi-detached pair and detrimental to the appearance of Rose Avenue.
8. With respect to the proposed porch there are a number of examples of front porch extensions in the estate. The majority of these adopt a monopitch roof form with the porch roof slope forming a continuation of the main roof. This is not what is proposed in this case. There is an example of a dual-pitched porch (as proposed on No 57) on the opposite side of Rose Avenue from the appeal property. However, in that case it is in the context of a single storey side extension whose roof form is a continuation of the existing eaves line and pitch of the roof to the main house. The appeal proposal in introducing a gabled dual pitch roof to the porch combined with a side extension design, markedly at odds with the character of the original house, would result in an incoherent appearance to the property and would simply increase the harm to the character and appearance of the frontage.
9. It has been put to me that the appeal property is at the end of the estate and not in a prominent position. However, this is not the case, the side extension would be visible to any pedestrian or vehicular traffic approaching Rose Avenue along Johnston Avenue and along Rose Avenue itself. The incongruous design and its effect on the street scene would be prominent and obtrusive in these views.
10. With respect to the rear extension, of itself, the proposed store would be acceptable as it would be in matching materials and clearly subservient to the main house and set entirely to the rear of the property. However, it would be physically linked to the proposed side extension. Thus, whilst it is possible for me to issue a split decision, allowing one element of the proposal and dismissing another, in this case such an approach would not be possible because the rear extension would not be independent of the side extension.
11. I have been invited to conclude that the lack of any provision for the storage of waste and recycling receptacles would also result in an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the frontage. Whilst I accept that no direct provision is proposed, this is a matter that, were the appeal to be allowed and permission granted, could have been resolved by the imposition of a suitably worded condition. There would be space for a bin store in front of the side extension in the setback from the property frontage partially screened by the proposed porch and parked vehicles which, if suitably designed, would be no different to other cases in the estate where waste receptacles are stored on the frontage. This, in itself therefore, would not be a reason to dismiss the appeal.
12. The *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) at paragraph 130 requires that developments must be sympathetic to local character to create high quality buildings and spaces amongst other things and at paragraph 134 that development that is not well-designed should be refused. Policy P3 of the *Rochdale Core Strategy* (RCS), on improving design reflects the Framework in requiring development to have regard to the scale, density, massing, height and layout of surrounding buildings and areas and contribute positively to townscape by being well-proportioned. Similarly, Policy DM1 of the RCS also reflects the Framework in requiring all development including extensions to be to a high

quality design taking the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area. In order to assist householders in designing extensions, the Council has adopted the *Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) which states that extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

13. For the reasons above and notwithstanding my conclusion regarding the storage of waste, the proposed two storey side extension to the property would be out of keeping with the form and design of the original building and detrimental to its character and appearance and the character of its surroundings on Rose Avenue as a result of poor design. It would therefore be in conflict with Policies P3 and DM1 of the RCS, the SPD and the Framework.

Other Matters

14. I understand the appellant's wish to achieve additional accommodation through the extension and in that way make sustainable and effective use of housing land, an objective which is encouraged by the Framework in Section 11. However, paragraph 124 in the same section of the Framework states that this should not be at the expense of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting. I am not persuaded that the appellant's need for increased accommodation could not have been achieved in a design more in keeping with the original house and as such, sustainable and effective use of the dwelling would not, of itself, outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the original dwelling and Rose Avenue as a result of the proposal.

Conclusion

15. In reaching my decision I have had regard to the matters before me and for the reasons above the appeal should be dismissed.

P. D. Biggers

INSPECTOR