

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	9 <sup>th</sup> July 2020
Portfolio	Councillor Carol Wardle, Cabinet Member for Planning, Development & Housing
Report Author	Jessica Fearon
Public/Private Document	Public

<b>Application:</b> 19/00719/HOUS	<b>Township:</b> Heywood	<b>Ward:</b> Hopwood Hall
<b>Appeal Reference:</b> APP/P4225/D/19/3241900		<b>Decision level:</b> Delegated
<b>Site Address:</b> 11 Ullswater Grove, Heywood, OL10 2BL		
<b>Proposal:</b> Two storey rear extension following demolition of existing single storey extension		
<b>Applicant:</b> Duncan Cooper		<b>Agent:</b> n/a
<b>Planning Inspectorate Decision:</b> Appeal Allowed – 23 <sup>rd</sup> March 2020		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The application was refused due to the effect of the two storey extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene with regard to the timber cladding being considered to represent a prominent and incongruous addition. The application was also refused due to a loss of light and outlook to 13 Ullswater Grove.</li> <li>- The Inspector highlighted that properties have been variously extended over time which has resulted in a range of single storey and two storey rear extensions within Ullswater Grove and Grasmere Avenue. The inspector also states that the two existing single storey extensions at the applicant property do not make a positive contribution to the dwelling. It was considered that the scale and size of the two storey extension would be in keeping with that of the attached property.</li> <li>- The Inspector accepted that the timber cladding was not characteristic of the immediate area however stated that due to the limited views and tree screening, the small amount visible would not be prominent or discordant in the street scene.</li> <li>- Due to the position of the no.13, set back from the applicant property, the Inspector stated that the proposal would not project beyond the rear elevation on no.13 and would therefore not impact the rear facing windows or the rear garden of this neighbour. The Inspector acknowledged that the development would impact the small window on the side elevation of no.13 which is considered to be a principal window to a habitable room, given the 5m distance between the window and side elevation of the extension. However, it was found that the orientation of the two dwellings would not result in unacceptable overshadowing or loss of sunlight.</li> <li>- The Inspector further stated that the increased mass of development would be conspicuous however it would not obscure views past no.11 and would therefore not diminish the outlook enjoyed by no.13. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of no.13 in regard to loss of light and outlook.</li> </ul>		