

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/23/3318296

105 Heights Avenue, Rochdale OL12 6JH

- 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 Abdul Quyyom against the decision of Rochdale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01530/HOUS, dated 5 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is to remove existing front dormer and extend main wall to provide a new roof over altered front elevation including new mono pitched roof over study and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to remove existing front dormer and extend main wall to provide a new roof over altered front elevation including new mono pitched roof over study and porch at 105 Heights Avenue, Rochdale in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/01530/HOUS, dated 5 December 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: CL 11225791/10 - 14.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in the replacement of the front flat roofed dormer window structure by raising the front eaves of the house. This would have the effect of increasing the height of the main frontage of the dwelling at eaves level and providing a more unified front elevation. To achieve this the roof would have asymmetrical side gables. The new works would be rendered.
 4. The house is currently of a design that matches those of the neighbouring detached properties. This unified design does provide a consistent form of development within this cul-de-sac which is also carried through into the neighbouring street. The uniformity does provide some interest and identity to
-

this specific area. There are however numerous properties that have introduced new pitched cat-slide roofs to the original flat roof dormer structures, although they retain the low eaves and contrasting dormer features.

5. The proposal would introduce a new form of first floor development into the area. Its higher eaves and changed form would ensure that its frontage would differ from its neighbours. It is however on the end of a row of properties and set at an angle to its other neighbour. The proposed frontage would have simple detailing. Although the side facing gables would be asymmetrical, this revised design feature would not be prominent in views given the position of the two neighbouring dwellings. Although the box style flat roofed structures are a common theme within the area, this composition and detail is not of such architectural quality that its loss would be detrimental. Although differing from the neighbouring properties, the frontage would be well proportioned and the higher eaves would not be overly dominant. The composition overall would be satisfactory and the new form of the dwelling would sit relatively comfortably alongside its neighbours.
6. Generally, the dormer structures are not positive features of the original design and it is clear that other approaches to integrate them better into the frontage of the houses have been undertaken nearby. I am satisfied that this alternative approach would represent a suitably high standard of design and would continue to ensure that the dwelling would remain integrated within the street scene, with the differences proposed not being overly dominant or discordant. Although the changes seek to depart from the local context to some extent, they would respond positively to the townscape and improve the appearance of the dwelling. The changes do not therefore conflict with the design aspirations of policies DM1 or 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.
7. The council's design guidance is 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 proposal is a re-modelling rather than an extension. It is of interest that the guidance seeks to resist front dormers which are a feature of these original designs. The replacement of this front dormer structure with a more conventional roof would not therefore be at odds with the objectives of the guidance. The new works would introduce a simpler architectural style without dominating the neighbouring properties. The guidance does not anticipate the particular circumstances of this case and as such, any conflict with its specific requirements can be accepted as long as the fundamental objective of achieving good quality design is met. I am satisfied that in this case, the removal of the flat roof dormer structure would be a benefit and that the changes required to achieve this would be of a suitable design standard.
8. Overall, the proposal would result in an acceptable remodelling of this house which would not be out of keeping with the character of the area. It would not conflict with the Core Strategy policies and although it would not represent the type of changes considered by the Supplementary Planning Document guidance, it would be of a suitable design standard that would satisfy its overall

objectives. As there are no other matters that weigh against the proposal, I allow the appeal.

9. 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 plans demonstrate the materials to be used and as such, no further conditions are required.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR