



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: 21 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/23/3319254

80 Mossway, Middleton, Rochdale M24 1NS

- 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 Jamie Cloran against the decision of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01378/HOUS, dated 24 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and rear extension with hipped roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side and rear extension and rear dormer following demolition of existing side extension, at 80 Mossway, Rochdale M24 1NS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/01378/HOUS, dated 24 October 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Proposed Site and Location Plan - 22MWlp (1) Rev. 0;
 - Proposed Plans - 22MWpp Rev. 1;
 - Proposed Elevations - 22MWpe Rev. 0.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development in the banner heading is taken from the application form. However, the wording used on the decision notice and appeal form is "Two storey side and rear extension and rear dormer following demolition of existing side extension". I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposal, and I have therefore used it in my formal decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey, hipped roof, semi-detached dwelling on Mossway, within an established residential area. The red brick construction of the dwelling, its bay window and single storey attached side garage are typical design features of the area. The street scene is characterised by similar two storey semi-detached dwellings, set back from the road with low level boundary treatments and planting to the front gardens, with the occasional mature street tree within the footway. These features contribute positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
5. As originally built, the dwellings included a side driveway, providing a visual separation between each pair of semi-detached properties. However, a large proportion of properties have extended to the side, infilling these gaps. The majority of these side extensions are single storey, such as the one found on the appeal property. Nevertheless, a significant number of properties in the area have two storey side extensions, with some of these also extending further back beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling.
6. Based on my observations on site, and the evidence before me, I agree with the Council's assessment that the proposed two storey side extension, and the rear dormer, would be subservient and in keeping with the host property and surrounding dwellings in terms of their form, appearance and materials used.
7. I note the Council's concerns that the proposed two storey rear extension, when viewed in combination with the proposed side extension, would result in a large and overbearing expanse of brickwork, representing an incongruous addition to the host dwelling. However, the proposed rear extension would not be prominent in the street scene as most of the structure would be screened by the neighbouring property at 82 Mossway.
8. Furthermore, during my site visit I observed a number of properties that have been extended to the side and rear in a similar way to the appeal proposal, resulting in a large expanse of brickwork adjacent to the boundary with the neighbour. This includes the property on the opposite side of Mossway at No 75, which is located on a prominent corner plot at the junction with Duffield Road. Whilst I have not been provided with the full planning history details for each of these similar developments, and each application is judged on its own merits, the number of existing similar developments within the area is a material consideration in the determination of this appeal as they have altered the original built form of development, and urban grain, within this area.
9. Having viewed these existing similar developments within the vicinity, I do not consider that they have resulted in a visually harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the area and the host property, and the appeal proposal would result in a similar visual impact.
10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not constitute an incongruous addition to the host dwelling and would not result in a harmful effect on the host property, or the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy (2016) which seek to ensure high standards of design from new development, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document (2016), or those

principles of the National Planning Policy Framework that seek good design which is sympathetic to the local area.

Other Matters

11. In coming to the above view, I have given consideration to the previous appeal decision¹ at this property. Nevertheless, the current proposed development is materially different to that previously dismissed at appeal and has overcome the main concern of the previous Inspector by replacing the flat roof on the proposed two storey rear extension with a hipped roof design, which would be more in keeping with the host property and surrounding area.
12. I note the comments raised by the occupiers of the neighbouring property in respect of the proposed development blocking light, overshadowing, resulting in overlooking into their property and the visual impact of the expanse of brickwork. However, based on my observations on the site visit I agree with the assessment of the Council that the proposed development would not result in significant harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have attached a condition specifying the approved plans to provide certainty and a condition requiring matching materials to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

R Major

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/P4225/D/22/3301992