

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	5th November 2020
Portfolio	Councillor Carol Wardle, Cabinet Member for Planning, Development & Housing
Report Author	Ryan Killeen
Public/Private Document	Public

<b>Application:</b> 20/00538/HOUS	<b>Township:</b> Pennines	<b>Ward:</b> Smallbridge Firgrove
<b>Appeal Reference:</b> APP/P4225/D/20/3260659		<b>Decision level:</b> Delegated
<b>Site Address:</b> 383 Albert Royds Street, Rochdale, OL16 3AA		
<b>Proposal:</b> Single storey and two storey rear extension and alterations to front and side elevation fenestration - Resubmission of 19/01472/HOUS		
<b>Applicant:</b> Mrs Sana Yaqoob		<b>Agent:</b> Mr Jamil Ahmed
<b>Planning Inspectorate Decision:</b> Appeal Dismissed – 22 October 2020		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The application was refused due to the extension resulting in inadequate light and outlook for a bedroom, with only an obscured window serving a first floor ‘Study’ that had significant potential to be used as a bedroom. This was considered 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.</li> <li>– The Inspector highlighted that the whilst the SPD does exclude box rooms and studies as habitable rooms, it is only supplementary guidance and given an increase in home working, particularly as a result of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, they saw no reason as to why a study should not be considered a habitable room in which future occupants are likely to spend considerable amounts of time.</li> <li>– With no window to serve the proposed study/store room, the Inspector stated that the space would have no independent source of daylight and no outlook, resulting in a dark, oppressive and claustrophobic environment for its future occupiers.</li> <li>– As a condition requiring an obscure glazed window would not address the lack of outlook, the Inspector concluded that it would fail to overcome the harm identified and would not provide acceptable living conditions for future occupants, with regard to daylight and outlook. This would be contrary to policy DM1 of the Adopted Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework.</li> <li>– Other matters included the appellant’s assertions that the overall design of the proposal would be proportionate and in keeping with the overall character of the immediate area, and would provide additional accommodation to meet family needs. The Inspector considered that these matters did not outweigh the harm identified.</li> </ul>		