

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2023

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/23/3317143

11 Champion Way, Rochdale OL12 7UL

- 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 S Butterworth against the decision of Rochdale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01160/HOUS, dated 25 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 11 Champion Way, Rochdale in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/01160/HOUS, dated 25 August 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 22.2939.3 and 22.2939.2B.
 - 3) The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in materials that match those of the existing house.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a first floor extension above the existing garage. The council are concerned that this would not be a subordinate addition and that the front facing gable would be an incongruous feature within the street scene.
 4. As the extension would extend forward of the main front building line, it would be a relatively prominent new addition. It would however introduce a distinctive gable which would add interest to the overall composition of the front elevation. The gable would not match that of the small gable over the main first floor window and a larger gable would perhaps be more in keeping
-

with the overall proportions of the house. Nevertheless, it would not be at odds with the simple design of the dwelling and it would reflect details incorporated into the design of other properties in the area which are of a similar character. It would not detract from either the appearance of the house or the character or appearance of the area.

5. The proposal represents a suitably high standard of design and it would be in keeping with the character of the area as required by policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy 2016. These policies accord with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and can be afforded full weight.
6. The council suggest that the proposal is in conflict with the design guidance set out in their Supplementary Planning Document Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development 2016. This advises that extensions should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient. This addition would be in keeping with the general simple design characteristics of the dwelling. It would not be subservient but the guidance does not insist on subservience. The council accept that they do not have a concern with regard to terracing and therefore the requirements to set the extension back and down are not necessary. The guidance accepts that in some circumstances, larger extensions may be acceptable. I consider this to be such a case.
7. Overall, the proposal would result in an acceptable addition to this house which would be in keeping with the design of the houses within the area. It would not conflict with either the Core Strategy policies or the Supplementary Planning Document guidance as this allows for suitable departures from its main standards when judged on a case by case basis. As there are no other matters that weigh against the proposal, I allow the appeal.
8. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and the details of the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. The application form sets out that the details would match and I have imposed a condition requiring this to ensure that the extension would have a satisfactory appearance.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR