



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 August 2022

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/22/3301940

59 Heywood Hall Road, Heywood, OL10 4UZ

- 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 Ralph Hall against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00374/HOUS, dated 22 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is a "Proposed single storey rear extension; Proposed single storey front extension; Proposed construction of new 1st floor including construction of front and rear dormers."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a "Proposed single storey rear extension; Proposed single storey front extension; Proposed construction of new 1st floor including construction of front and rear dormers" at 59 Heywood Hall Road, Heywood, OL10 4UZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00374/HOUS, dated 22 March 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building, except where specified on the approved drawings.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, and the details therein; Existing Ground Floor and Site Plan: P01, Proposed Ground Floor and Site Plan: P01, Existing and Proposed First Floor and Roof Plans: P03, Existing and Proposed Front and East Facing Side Elevation: P04, Existing and Proposed Front and West Facing Side Elevation: P05, Existing and Proposed Site Plans: P06.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of Park Terrace with specific regard to loss of light, outlook and any overbearing effects.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached, chalet-style bungalow on Heywood Hall Road, a residential street on which the houses exhibit a wide variety of scale, form, materials, character, appearance and relationship to neighbouring properties. Park Terrace runs perpendicular to Heywood Hall Road, and as such, the rear of it faces the appeal site, albeit separated by its gardens, various outbuildings, boundaries and a grassed alleyway.
5. The existing chalet-bungalow on the site already has a gabled side element which extends close to the site boundary, adjacent to the grassed alleyway. According to the Council, this gable is 12.5m from the rear of Park Terrace; shorter than the 14m required by the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document, June 2016 (the SPD) between "*a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window*". The proposal would substantially increase the width of this gable and slightly increase its height, as well as see the addition of front and rear facing dormers, although the separation distance would remain the same.
6. The proposal would clearly lead to an increase in the size and scale of the gable close to the site boundary. I accept that as a result of this, given its scale and position, the proposal would obviously be visible from Park Terrace, although the ridge of the main, original house would remain higher than the proposal.
7. However, given the overall separation distance, the orientation and relationship of the site to its neighbours and the existing situation, I do not consider that the change which would result from the proposal would cause unacceptable or harmful loss of light or outlook. In my opinion, the outlook from Park Terrace would remain substantially the same; longer views from upper stories would be largely unaffected, and views from ground-floor windows and indeed, gardens, are already affected by the existing building on the site as well as alterations, outbuildings and boundaries on Park Terrace. Effects on light would be similar. Although the proposal would increase the scale of the building at the boundary, I find that any reduction in light and outlook, particularly at ground-floor level would be minimal and therefore acceptable.
8. Turning to any overbearing effect, again, I note the existing situation, and in particular the overall height and scale of the host property. Whilst the scale of the gable facing Park Terrace would increase, given the separation distance and the overall scale of the host property, particularly relative to the scale of Park Terrace and the lower levels of the appeal site, I am satisfied that the proposal would not give rise to any unacceptable overbearing effect. In reaching this conclusion, I note that the addition of front and rear facing dormers with their cheeks clad in timber would provide visual interest and variety, giving some relief to the elevation facing Park Terrace.

9. I note that the Council finds all other aspects of the proposal, including the front and rear dormers, timber cladding, overall design, scale and appearance to be acceptable. I agree with this position.
10. I therefore find that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of Park Terrace with specific regard to any loss of light, outlook or any overbearing effects in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy 2016. This policy requires, amongst other things, that development of this nature is compatible with its surroundings and causes no harm to amenity.
11. For the same reasons, and having regard to the details of the site, its relationship to Park Terrace, and the specific effects of the proposal, I am satisfied that the proposal as a whole accords with the overarching aim of the SPD to ensure high quality design and development which protects the amenity of occupiers of adjoining properties. I also find that the proposal would accord with guidance on amenity set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Conditions

12. The Council has suggested a number of conditions to be attached, should planning permission be granted. Having had regard to the requirements of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance I have imposed standard conditions concerning commencement (1), requiring the use of matching materials (2), albeit with an allowance for the introduction of timber cladding, and compliance with the submitted plans (3), in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the completed development. I am satisfied that these conditions, which I have imposed, meet the tests in, and requirements of both the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal accords with the development plan and there are no material considerations which indicate that a decision be taken other than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be allowed, and planning permission granted.

S Dean

INSPECTOR