



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2022

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 June 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/22/3297088

3 Mainway, Middleton, Rochdale, M24 1LE

- 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 Kane Vincent against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00147/HOUS, dated 5 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is two-storey front and side extension, single storey rear extension, alterations to the roof to accommodate loft conversion and alterations to fenestration on the front, rear and side elevations following the removal of two chimneys and a rear porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two-storey front and side extension, single storey rear extension, alterations to the roof to accommodate loft conversion and alterations to fenestration on the front, rear and side elevations following removal of two chimneys and a rear porch at 3 Mainway, Middleton, Rochdale, M24 1LE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00147/HOUS, dated 5 February 2022, 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: 2021-1563A-P-102 Rev A, 2021-1563A-P-103 Rev B, 2021-1563A-P-104 Rev C, 2021-1563A-P-107 and 2021-1563A-P-107.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be those detailed on the application forms and drawing number 2021-1563A-P-104 Rev C.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. 3 Mainway is a two-storey detached house that has previously been altered and extended. Its original red brick walls, with the exception of the western elevation, have been mostly rendered over, the red tile roof has been altered

and replaced with flat grey tiles and the original window and door frames have been replaced with white UPVC. Other nearby dwellings on Mainway have also been significantly extended, altered and modernised over time resulting in a varied street scene.

4. It is proposed to replace the two chimney breasts on the western side of the house and the curved bay windows to the front of the house with a new two-storey wrap around extension. The extension would have a gable front and the front windows would be situated within a forward brick projection, similar to a bay window, albeit without any side glazing. Front gable projections are not uncommon along Mainway. A suitable gap would be retained between the extension, the side boundary and the neighbouring dwelling. There is no evidence before me to suggest that the minor alterations to the entrance porch, windows and garage would require planning permission. Even if this was the case, the proposed changes would not, in my view, result in any harm or conflict with policy.
5. In addition to the front gable, two gables would be constructed in the rear roof slope, in order to accommodate a loft conversion. The ridge height would not exceed that of the existing dwelling and the pitch, although very slightly steeper than the existing one, would continue to slope away from neighbouring dwellings, retaining to some extent its original shape, form and the sense of space between properties. To my mind this design solution is far superior to the alternative options for utilising the roof space, which would entail either adding hip to gable extensions or dormers.
6. No objections have been raised to the single storey rear extension and I concur with the view that this would not result in any harm.
7. Although some original features such as the chimneys, the curved bay windows and the arched entrance porch would be lost, given that the dwelling is not a heritage asset and is not located within a conservation area or uniformed street scene, the loss of these would not be detrimental to the character of the host dwelling or the street scene. Nor do I find that the siting, scale and design of the extensions would constitute unduly prominent or incongruous additions within the varied street scene. Whilst I acknowledge that other extensions and alterations to the appeal property and to dwellings within the surrounding area may pre-date current policies and guidance, they nevertheless form part of the existing character and appearance of the area.
8. I therefore find no conflict with Policies DM1 or P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy (Adopted October 2016), the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD (Adopted June 2016) or the National Planning Policy Framework, which collectively seek to ensure amongst other things that new development is of high quality design, which respects its local context.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. Conditions relating to materials are necessary to ensure that the development would not harmfully detract from the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR