



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2023

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 April 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/23/3314624 258 Oldham Road, Middleton M24 2DP

- 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 Bradley Marshall against the decision of Rochdale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01165/HOUS, dated 30 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is front dormer extension and alteration to existing rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development used in the banner heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice as it is a much more succinct description than provided in the planning application form, and accurately describes the development before me.
3. The application was made retrospectively and I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the front and rear dormer extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. No.258 Oldham Road (No.258) is a two-storey dwelling located within a terrace of similar dwellings on the southern side of Oldham Road.
6. The dormer roof extension to the front roof plane of No.258 is around 4.4m in width and 1.79m in height, aligning with the ridge of the main roof, with a flat roof and overhanging eaves. The guidance in the Council's *Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document* (2016) (SPD) is that dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted, recognising that they can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway. It is acknowledged that the design of the front dormer is consistent with most of the principles applied to dormer extensions at paragraph 5.17 of the SPD, and that there may be circumstances

that justify a relaxation of these guidelines. However, although set well in from the sides of the roof and offset from the eaves, I observed on my site visit that the front dormer extension occupies much more than a relatively small area of the roof plane, as alleged by the appellant. Rather it consumes the roof plane and appears as an overly dominant and unsympathetic addition to No.258.

7. Further, whilst I note that dwellings in the area, as you would expect, have been altered and extended in various ways, there is nonetheless a uniformity in roof form along this part of Oldham Road and no examples of large, box dormers on the front roof plane. Its size and siting means that the dormer is visually prominent and incongruous in the streetscene to the detriment of its character and uniform appearance.
8. In March 2021 the Council issued a Certificate of Lawfulness of Proposed Development (21/00324/CPL) for a rear dormer extension that was around 4.97m in width and 2.54m in height, filling much of the rear roof plane of No.258 (the Certificate dormer). It is clear from the submitted drawings and my site visit that the height of the rear dormer extension has been reduced such that it sits further off the eaves of the rear roof plane. Despite the roofline just extending above the ridge line of the existing roof, I do not find that the rear dormer as built would cause any greater harm to the host property or be more visible from Highfield Street than the Certificate dormer; a fall-back position afforded weight in this case.
9. Although I find the rear dormer acceptable, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the front dormer extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Consequently, as well as the conflict with the SPD guidance, the development conflicts with Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy (2016) which requires development to be of high quality design that takes the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area. It would also be contrary to the guidance at paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) that development should be visually attractive and add to the overall quality of an area.

Conclusions

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

R. Jones

INSPECTOR