



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2023

by R Major BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/23/3321905

68 Springfield Road, Middleton, Rochdale M24 5DL

- 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 Ms Liz Evans against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00154/HOUS, dated 12 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is front and rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the application form contains an error but this has been corrected on the decision notice and within Section E of the appeal form. I have used the amended wording within the banner heading, as this is more accurate, and have also removed the word 'retrospective' from the description as this does not constitute an act of development.
3. At the site visit, I saw that dormer extensions had already been constructed at the front and rear of the property. These differ in size and design to the dormers shown on the proposed plans. The Council made its decision against those plans and I have dealt with the appeal on the same basis.
4. The appellant has submitted details (appendix III) explaining that, in their opinion, the rear dormer complies with Schedule 2 Part 1, Class B of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, and consequently does not require planning permission. However, this is not a matter for me to determine in the context of an appeal made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act). It is open to the appellant to apply to have this matter determined under sections 191 or 192 of the Act. Any such application would be unaffected by my determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. Springfield Road, and the surrounding area in general, is predominantly characterised by semi-detached dwellings set back from the highway with front gardens and driveways. There is a gentle slope to the street, rising upwards

from south to north, with the appeal property being located towards the higher end of this street, resulting in its roof being prominently visible when viewed from the south. There are a mix of both hipped and pitched roof styles within the locality, however front and rear dormer extensions are not a characteristic of Springfield Road or the wider locality.

7. Whilst each pair of semi-detached dwellings are not identical in appearance due to more recent alterations that have been undertaken, the matching roof designs found on the vast majority of dwellings creates a balance and sense of symmetry to the roofscape of each block, contributing positively to the character and appearance of this suburban area.
8. The introduction of front and rear dormer extensions to the appeal property unbalances the symmetry with the adjoining property, to the detriment of the appearance of the host property, its adjoining dwelling and the surrounding area in general. The visual impact and prominence of the development in the street scene is exacerbated by the appeal property's position at the higher end of this sloping street; the flat roof design of the dormers being set up to the height of the existing ridgeline; and the use of oak coloured UPVC cladding which does not match the existing roof material of the host dwelling. The proposal therefore runs contrary to the advice contained within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).
9. In view of the above, the appeal scheme is contrary to the objectives of policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 2016 which seek to ensure, amongst other things, that all development proposals are of a high-quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area; have regard to materials; and contribute positively to the townscape.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has referred to dormer extensions being a feature on Clough Road, however these are not located and viewed within the same street scene as the appeal property. Furthermore, the existence of other dormer extensions in the wider area does not justify the harm I have identified, and I have determined the appeal on its own merits against the most up to date planning policies.

Conclusion

11. The proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations to indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. Accordingly, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Major

INSPECTOR