

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	9 th July 2020
Portfolio	Councillor Carol Wardle, Cabinet Member for Planning, Development & Housing
Report Author	Ryan Killeen
Public/Private Document	Public

Application: 19/01312/HOUS	Township: Middleton	Ward: North Middleton
Appeal Reference: APP/P4225/D/20/3245313		Decision level: Delegated
Site Address: 8 Canterbury Crescent, Middleton, M24 2TJ		
Proposal: Two storey side extension and alterations to existing rear elevation		
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Urwin		Agent: Phil Corns
Planning Inspectorate Decision: Appeal Allowed – 31 March 2020		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The application was refused due to the effect of the two-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the street scene, with regard to its siting, size and design and the consequential terracing effect 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. There were also issues with the lack of regard for bin storage. - The Inspector highlighted that the gap between the applicant dwelling and adjacent dwelling reflects the typical pattern of development, however it had been eroded throughout the estate and is no longer a significantly prevailing feature in this particular street scene. - The Inspector stated that the proposal would not accord with the level of setback required in the Council's <i>Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development</i> SPD, but nevertheless, would still be subservient to the host dwelling and adjacent dwelling in light of the design and differing eaves and ridge heights. - It was stated that the objective of the SPD to maintain an adequate differential between properties would still be achieved in this particular instance, even in the case where the adjacent dwelling extends in a similar manner. The particular circumstances of the case justified an exception to the strict adherence to the requirements of the SPD, as allowed for in section 5.13. - The inspector highlighted that the storage of waste bins in the immediate street scene varied between the front, side and rear of dwellings. The proposal would not be dissimilar from many properties in the immediate street scene, and would not present an alien feature and would not present an unacceptable level of harm. - The Inspector concluded that the proposal did not constitute a poor standard of design and no harm was identified to the character and appearance of the street scene with particular regard to the terracing effect and refuse bin storage. The appeal was therefore allowed. 		