



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2023

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/23/3315213

10 Broadhalgh Road, Rochdale OL11 5NJ

- 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 Mrs Alison Aspden against the decision of Rochdale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00833/HOUS, dated 20 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension, front porch extension, single storey rear extension, construction of front boundary wall and gate for vehicle access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development given above is taken from the decision notice and appeal form since it more fully describes the proposal than the description on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached dwelling which is, except for a further pair of semi-detached dwellings that adjoin the site, within a street of detached properties of varying design and appearance.
5. The appeal property and the attached dwelling, No.12 Broadhalgh Road, form a well-balanced and symmetrical pair as do the adjoining semi-detached properties. Whilst the two pairs of dwellings differ in design and appearance they harmonise with each other, given that both feature front gables and bay windows. Such a complementary and symmetrical appearance contributes positively to the character of the area, providing a counterpoint to the much larger detached dwellings in the locality.
6. The proposal includes a front porch and a single storey extension which the Council has not raised any objections to. Given the modest size of porch and the discrete siting of the single storey extension on the rear elevation, I am satisfied that these elements of the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene.

7. The appellant has sought to create a balance and symmetry in the appearance of the host property by introducing a further gable feature on the front elevation. However, the comparable width to the existing gable would result in the proposed side extension appearing as a dominant feature despite that its ridge line would be set lower than that of the existing dwelling.
8. The forward projection and front gable of the proposed side extension would disrupt the pleasantly well-proportioned façade of the appeal property, and unbalance its appearance. Moreover, the side extension would erode the clear sense of balance and symmetry that exists between the appeal property and the attached No. 12. Notwithstanding that there is no uniformity of architectural style, or other similarly designed semi-detached dwellings within the street, such a loss of balance and symmetry would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to the existence of side extensions to two dwellings close to the appeal site. In both cases I consider that the extensions that have been constructed are not subservient to the host dwelling. Even so, both properties are detached and therefore differ from the appeal before me. The existence of such extensions does not, therefore, weigh in favour of the appeal proposal which I have determined on its individual planning merits.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies DM1 and P2 of the Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy (2016) and the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development, Supplementary Planning Document (2016). Amongst other things, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that development is of a high-quality design which respects local context.

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge that the proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of neighbours due to loss of privacy or light or result in environmental or highway safety harm has been identified. However, the lack of harm in these respects are neutral factors and do not overcome the harm identified above.

Conclusion

12. The two storey side extension conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the harm and associated development plan conflict.
13. Accordingly, I consider that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR