

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	6 th February 2020
Portfolio	Councillor Carol Wardle, Cabinet Member for Planning, Development & Housing
Report Author	Ryan Killeen
Public/Private Document	Public

Application: 19/00244/HOUS	Township: Pennines	Ward: Milnrow and Newhey
Appeal Reference: APP/P4225/D/19/3233572		Decision level: Delegated
Site Address: 54 Pennine Drive, Milnrow, OL16 3HG		
Proposal: Erection of front and rear dormer extensions		
Applicant: Mr Connor Karran		Agent: John Heslop
Planning Inspectorate Decision: Appeal Dismissed – 2 January 2020		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The application was refused as the dormers would constitute unduly prominent and incongruous additions to the property and 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. - The Inspector highlighted that a relaxed view could be taken with regard to the suitability of the front facing dormer. However, whilst the design of the front dormer demonstrated acceptable characteristics in response to the character and appearance of the local area, the scale and bulk of the proposed front dormer would not be well proportioned in relation to the front roof plane and thus not respect the site's local context. - The Inspector also highlighted similar issues with the proposed rear dormer. Whilst the proposals seek to include a flat roof that responds well to local character and materials to match, it is not modest in size and occupies nearly all the property's rear roof plane. - The appellant drew attention to three similar schemes in the local area, however the Inspector noted that one of the schemes highlighted was determined prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy (CS) and The Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), and the front dormer extensions in the other two schemes were smaller and positioned higher up the front roof plane, and as such, were not suitable for a direct comparison. - The Inspector concluded that the proposal would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area. The appeal scheme would not enhance the boroughs sense of place and therefore would not accord with CS policies DM1 and P3 and the SPD. The appeal was therefore dismissed. 		