

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	04 February 2021
Portfolio	Councillor John Blundell, Cabinet Member for a Thriving Economy
Report Author	Majid Mir
Public/Private Document	Public

<b>Application:</b> 20/00819/HOUS	<b>Township:</b> Pennines	<b>Ward:</b> Milnrow & Newhey
<b>Appeal Reference:</b> APP/P4225/D/20/3260279		<b>Decision level:</b> Delegated
<b>Site Address:</b> 21 Bentgate Street, Milnrow, OL16 4JS		
<b>Proposal:</b> Single storey side and rear extension - Resubmission of 20/00427/HOUS		
<b>Applicant:</b> Mr & Mrs Knowles		<b>Agent:</b> Mr Kelly
<b>Planning Inspectorate Decision:</b> Appeal Dismissed – 19th January 2021		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The application was refused as the siting, size and design of the extension would have led to an inappropriate addition. On a prominent corner property, it would have had an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the street.</li> <li>– Though the extension would have been set back and screened from some vantage points, the inspector considered that due to the open, corner location of the property, it would have been clearly visible, particularly when viewed from Hawthorne Lane and the junction with Bentgate Street.</li> <li>– The inspector noted that small scaled, flat roofed extensions and outbuildings can be commonly found on similar corner properties in the vicinity. In comparison, the extension would have had a footprint that was significant in relation to the host property. The inspector believed that the large expanse of the flat roof would have been a conspicuous feature in the street scene, and would have been at odds with the smaller, more low key, flat roofed buildings in the surrounding area.</li> <li>– The inspector stated that owing to its siting and large flat roof, the extension would fail to respect the host property and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The inspector did not believe that using matching materials, windows and doors, would have been sufficient to overcome this harm.</li> <li>– The inspector found the extension would have been in conflict with policies DM1 and P3 of the Core Strategy and the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD. The inspector pointed to the requirements of the Core Strategy and SPD for developments to be of high quality design which respects context and be in keeping with the host property.</li> <li>– The inspector concluded that the proposal would have been in conflict with the development plan as a whole and no other considerations outweighed the conflict.</li> </ul>		