



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2023

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/23/3314188
54 Norden Road, Rochdale OL11 5PN

- 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 Fayyaz Chaudhry against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/00846/HOUS dated 22 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2022.
 - The application is for two storey side extension, single storey rear extensions, two storey front extension and new roof over resulting dwelling footprint, following demolition of existing attached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the Council's Decision Notice and differs from that used on the Application Form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development is the same as that used on the decision notice and this is confirmed through an email within the Appellant's notes. Accordingly, I have used the description given on the Council's Decision Notice that I feel more accurately describes the proposed development.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the living conditions of neighbours.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached modern house likely dating to around the 1970's or early 1980's. The property is well set back from Norden Road and as a result the site is partially shielded from the main road by foliage and trees. A driveway runs past a detached garage before arriving at the house where an integral double garage is attached to the property. To the rear there is a relatively modest garden with screen fencing and foliage providing some privacy from other surrounding properties.
5. To the south of the appeal property stand a pair of grand Victorian houses at number 50 and 48 Norden Road. These exhibit much architectural detail and

are of a much grandeur proportion and scale to that of the appeal property, which not only sits noticeably lower, but is also built of a different, less vertical proportion. This sets it apart architecturally from that of the older buildings next door.

6. One of these neighbours, Number 50, not only has a principal frontage facing towards Norden Road, but also has its main entrance to its side elevation whereby a double frontage, with central doorway, faces onto the appeal site. Such an arrangement would lead me to believe that at some point in time there was an historic relationship between the appeal site and that of number 50. Despite this, had there been any such historic relationship, it has now been diluted through boundary planting and the separation of ownership since, but this secondary principal elevation remains.
7. The proposal before me intends to considerably extend the existing house at number 54 in order to create a larger property. In so doing the proposal would create a double fronted house with two projecting hipped roof gables extending into the front garden area. There would also be a small extension to the rear with floor to ceiling bi fold type doors giving access onto the rear garden.
8. In terms of the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of neighbours, I consider that the principal impact would occur through the front projection of the right hand forward extension and its relationship to the side elevation of number 50. Despite the appeal building being set down and being of a hipped roof design, this projection would extend a considerable distance across the side elevation of its neighbour to such an extent as to impede upon the outlook and sense of spaciousness that number 50 currently enjoys.
9. This impact is further compounded by the distance of 10.3 being noticeably less than that recommended by the Council's Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document¹ (SPD), which recommends a distance of 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window.
10. Despite the set down of the appeal site and the efforts to mitigate this impact through hipped roofs, as well as one of the rooms to the ground floor of number 50 being double aspect, ultimately, I consider that the proposal would cause harm to what is in effect a principal and important elevation of number 50 Norden Road. This would be to such an extent as to adversely affect the living conditions of residents using these side rooms as well as compromising the overall aesthetic value of the Victorian building whose design and functionality relies somewhat upon this side elevation being useable as a primary entrance into the house.
11. Ultimately I consider that there would be ways to extend this property in a manner that could alleviate the impact upon the neighbours whilst meeting the requirements of the Appellant's to improve their house. However, I find that the proposal before me would result in harm to the living conditions of those residents at number 50 Norden Road. As such the proposal before me would be contrary to Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD and the appeal must fail.

¹ Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (Adopted 2016)

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR