

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	30 th May 2018
Portfolio	Councillor Daalat Ali Cabinet Member for Planning & Housing
Report Author	Michael Atkinson-Smith
Public/Private Document	Public

Application: 17/00942/HOUS	Township: Rochdale	Ward: Norden
Appeal reference: APP/P4225/D/18/3192608		
Site Address: 35 Beechfield, Rochdale OL11 5PA		
Proposal: Changes to fenestration in front, rear and side elevations, application of a rendered finish to all elevations, internal alterations and erection of a detached garage		
Applicant: Mr Paul Lewin		Agent: James Campbell Associates
Decision level: Delegated (Subject to Call Up)		
Planning Inspectorate Decision: Appeal dismissed 9 th April 2018		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The application was refused on the grounds of design and neighbour amenity, with the main issues being the effect on visual amenity of the proposed use of materials and the removal of the existing front bay window, the effect of the proposed garage on the character and appearance of the area with regards to its siting and the potential overbearing impact and overshadowing of Nos. 38 & 40 Norden Road as a result of the proposed garage. - The Inspector agreed that the application of a rendered finish and timber horizontal cladding in place of red brick and uPVC panelling would appear incongruous within the cohesive row of bungalows. The Inspector acknowledged that similar contemporary materials had been applied elsewhere in the wider area, but amongst a varied palette of materials in different street scenes. The removal of the existing bay window was also found to result in harm to the character and appearance of the area given that such features are a defining characteristic of the dwellings on Beechfield. - The Inspector afforded little weight to the SPD in the siting of the garage given that it does not contain guidance on the appeal scenario. However, in referring to policy DM1, the Inspector agreed that that the proposed garage would have an overbearing impact on the occupants of No. 40 Norden Way through visual intrusion. Contrary to the LPA's refusal reason, the impact on No. 38 Norden Way was not considered by the Inspector to be significant. - Despite the position to the front of the dwelling, the Inspector did not agree that the siting of the proposed garage would be incongruous on the street scene due to the context in which it would be read in relation to the existing boundary treatment and the built forms of Nos. 36-40 Norden Road. However, this was considered to be outweighed by the harm found in relation to the living conditions of the occupants of No. 40 Norden Way. - Accordingly, two refusal reasons were upheld and the appeal was dismissed. 		

