



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2024

**by R. Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 12 August 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/P4225/D/24/3342773**

**7 Greenwich Close, Rochdale OL11 5JN**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr M Muther against the decision of Rochdale Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/00011/HOUS.
  - The development proposed is retrospective application for the erection of single storey extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the single-storey extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

## Reasons

3. No.7 Greenwich Close (No.7) is a detached, two-storey dwelling situated to the north of the turning head on Greenwich Close, a residential cul-de-sac. On its south-eastern side, No.7 benefits from an existing single-storey extension (the original extension), set back from the principal elevation of the dwelling and set off the shared boundary with its neighbour at No.9 Greenwich Close (No.9). I observed that the original extension is modest in scale, with a hipped roof form and had been constructed in brick and render to match the host dwelling.
4. The appeal proposal relates to a single-storey extension which has been constructed such that it wraps around the original extension to the side, and across the rear elevation up to an existing conservatory extension. The planning application form states that the appeal proposal is constructed in brick and blockwork (to match existing) but my observations on site were that it appears constructed with steel upstands, UPVC doors and glazed panels and fascia boards; so, appearing a more temporary structure that the planning application form suggests.
5. The extension has been designed with a flat roof, which I accept is a common (and often successful) approach to single-storey rear extensions. In this case, however, the flat roof sits below, although not well aligned, with the eaves of the hipped roof of the original extension and right up to the pyramid roof of the conservatory. Its design appears somewhat ill-conceived and the different roof

- profiles, and junctures between them, appear clumsy, resulting in an addition that is unsympathetic to its host.
6. No.7 is a large, detached dwelling with a generous rear garden and I do not find that the projection, width or height of the single-storey extension is, in itself, disproportionate to its host.
  7. The single-storey side extension is set back from both the principal elevation and original side extension to No.7 and currently projects along the common boundary with its neighbour at No.9. Despite this set-back, part of the extension, which includes a door on the front elevation, is clearly visible from Greenwich Close. The siting of No.7 and No.9 off the turning head of the cul-de-sac mean they are slightly angled toward each other (with No.9 at a lower level) and by extending so close to No.9 the original visual break between the two is lost, resulting in a terracing effect. The roof profile of the extension to No.7 sits below the eaves of the original extension, and is slightly sloped at this point, appearing an incongruous addition to both its host and the wider streetscene.
  8. No.7 sits within a generous plot, with a triangular shaped rear garden, and was originally well offset from the common boundaries with No.5 and No.9 Greenwich Close. I note that it is proposed to alter the single-storey extension such that the rear is 'squared-off,' thereby reducing its depth along the boundary with No.9. I accept this would improve the visual break between No.7 and its neighbour, but it does not address my concerns regarding the design of the extension, its relationship with its host and appearance from Greenwich Close. Nor does the need for additional storage space and a gym outweigh the harm I have found.
  9. On balance, I therefore conclude on the main issue that the single-storey extension is an unsympathetic and incongruous addition which causes significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. Consequently, it conflicts with policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy (2016) which, amongst other things, requires new development to adhere to high standards of design, take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area, and respect context having regard to layout.
  10. It further conflicts with the general guidance at paragraph 5.1 of the Council's *Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development SPD (2016)* that house extensions should be in keeping with the host property. Finally, the appeal proposal fails to accord with the guidance at paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework that decisions should ensure that development is visually attractive as a result of good architecture and are sympathetic to local character.

## **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*R. Jones*

INSPECTOR