



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2022

by K Winnard LL.B (Hons) Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/22/3301939

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 Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00192/HOUS, dated 13 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and front canopy (resubmission of 21/01461/HOUS).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of the development in the banner heading above as altered by the Council. I note that this is also the description used by the appellants' agent within the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, No 2 Rectory Street (No 2), is located on a spacious corner plot at the southern end of Rectory Street. Notwithstanding that the appeal property and the adjoining semi detached dwelling are of a different style and age to the majority of properties on Rectory Street, there is a symmetry and cohesive character of development in this location. In this respect I agree with the Inspector in a previous appeal¹ who found that there was a balanced form and regular rhythm of development to the street.
5. The Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Developments Supplementary Planning Document (2016) (SPD) provides that extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it. The proposed extension would be a full two stories in height to reflect the existing house and would occupy a large part of the side garden between the side of the dwelling and the boundary fence. Due to its

¹ APP/P4225/D/21/3288358

substantial width, the proposed extension would be a sizeable addition and would result in a large dwelling, almost doubling its size. Notwithstanding design features to achieve some subservience and the generous size of the garden, the extension would appear unduly prominent and disproportionate to the size of the host dwelling.

6. I acknowledge the efforts made to overcome the concerns expressed by the Inspector in the previous appeal. However, the reduction in width would be small and the resultant extension would still be a substantial addition to the host property and disproportionate to its size. The extent of the width proposed would detract from the appearance of balance and symmetry with the attached dwelling and would disrupt the pattern of regular development to the detriment of the host property and the streetscene. Accordingly, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
7. My attention has been drawn to other developments within the locality where large extensions have been allowed. I do not have the details of the circumstances in which these extensions have been accepted and so cannot make comparisons with the current appeal proposal. In any event the existence of these extensions does not justify development which would otherwise be unacceptable.
8. The appellant indicates that there has been a previous approval for a large extension to the appeal property, granted in 2014, but not implemented. I accept that this demonstrates that an extension is in principle acceptable. I note also that the Inspector in the previous appeal acknowledged this to be the case. However, I give limited weight to the previous approval. Each case must be considered on its own merits, taking into account local and national policies and guidance which post-date the 2014 decision.
9. I note also that the Council has no objections to the proposal with regard to the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. The absence of harm in this respect does not weigh in favour of the proposal. I note too that the proposal would be constructed in matching materials, however aspects of good design are fundamental to all development, as stated within the National Planning Policy Framework, and would not represent a notable benefit. Nor does the absence of harm in respects of other criteria set out in Policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy (2016) (Core Strategy) weigh in favour of the development as now proposed.
10. Accordingly, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policies DM1 and P3 of the Core Strategy which require development to be of high quality and to contribute positively to the townscape and be well proportioned. It would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to promote development sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I hereby dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard INSPECTOR