

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	27 November 2019
Portfolio	Councillor Carol Wardle, Cabinet Member for Planning, Development & Housing
Report Author	Ryan Killeen
Public/Private Document	Public

Application: 19/00287/HOUS	Township: Pennines	Ward: Milnrow and Newhey
Appeal Reference: APP/P4225/D/19/3232372		Decision level: Delegated
Site Address: 3 Grange Avenue, Milnrow, OL16 4ET		
Proposal: Proposed two storey rear extension		
Applicant: Mrs Donna Crowley		Agent: Ian Bridge Consultancy (North) Ltd.
Planning Inspectorate Decision: Appeal Dismissed – 30/09/2019		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The application for a two-storey rear extension to a semi-detached dormer bungalow was refused by the Council on two grounds: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The extension would be an unduly prominent and incongruous addition to the property and would have an adverse impact on the character of the host property and the surrounding area, contrary to the Council's <i>Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development</i> SPD, policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the NPPF. 2. The size, design and siting of the extension would result in an unacceptable loss of light and outlook to the rear windows of the adjoining dwelling, contrary to the Residential Development SPD, policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the NPPF. – The Inspector agreed with the Council that the proposed extension, forming a continuation of the existing flat roofed rear dormer, would alter the appearance of the house significantly and appear as a large, incongruous box. Although the extension would be located to the rear of the property, in light of visibility through gaps between houses on Grange Avenue and longer views from surrounding streets they agreed that the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. – The Inspector also agreed that the development would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property due to overbearing outlook and loss of light. – The appellant drew the Inspector's attention to nearby properties of similar original design, which had been extended to the rear; the Inspector noted that the extensions were of different design to the appeal scheme and that the appeal was to be determined on its own merits. The appeal was therefore dismissed. 		