



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2023

by J D Clark BA (Hons) DpTRP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/22/3308579

10 Elterwater Close, Middleton, Rochdale M24 5ST

- 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 Claire Catlin against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00760/HOUS, dated 8 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is raise ridge & loft conversion to include dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. To clarify, the proposal includes the addition of front and rear dormers as well as raising the height of the roof.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey house positioned at the end of a terrace of four houses. The terrace comprises two two-storey end houses with two three-storey houses between them. This design is reflected elsewhere in the surrounding area which otherwise comprises a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraces of three or four houses.
5. The host property is located at the end of a cul-de-sac but is visible from the road that runs to the rear of the house, Loweswater Drive. The proposal would raise the roof height of the house and introduce dormer windows in the front and rear elevations. Whilst varying roof heights are a characteristic of the area, dormers are not.
6. Due to their size and massing, proximity to the eaves and their flat roof design, the dormers would appear disproportionate in relation to the roof. They would appear as incongruous additions to the roofscape which would be out of keeping with the design of the house itself, the terrace and the surrounding area generally. Furthermore, the terrace follows a clear design pattern with the lower houses at either end. Notwithstanding that the height of No 10 would still be lower than the adjoining house, the proposal would significantly erode the

symmetry of the terrace by adding extra height to one of the end properties as well as adding unsympathetic dormers.

7. The appellant has submitted a number of photographs of houses in the area and I also noted the differences in roof heights at my site visit. However, these generally follow the design approach to the area as a whole which I have referred to above. Moreover, other than the photograph showing a dormer, the other houses appear as originally built. Whilst I have limited details of the house with the dormer, the roof pitch and design of house differs from No 10 and so I do not consider that it is directly comparable. I therefore attach limited weight to these other examples.
8. For the reasons stated above, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Core Strategy¹ policies DM1 and P3 which require development to demonstrate high quality design that enhances and makes a positive contribution to the townscape through design principles in relation to scale, massing and height, amongst other things. The proposal would also conflict with the general design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework². Furthermore, the prominence, size and design of the proposed dormers would conflict with the advice in the Council's SPD³.

Other Matters

9. I note that the appellant considers that the house is too small for a growing family and that the proposal is required to create improved living space. However, whilst the proposal would provide benefits for the appellant and her family and whilst I appreciate that that the opportunities to extend this house may be limited, this does not overcome the harm I have identified. Additionally, there is no evidence that the house failed to meet any appropriate standards applicable at the time of its construction, particularly with regard to bedroom size.

Conclusion

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

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

¹Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy October 2016.

² Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, 2021 (the Framework).

³ Rochdale Borough Council – Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development SPD, Adopted June 2016.