

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Date of Meeting | 18 March 2021 |
| Portfolio | Councillor John Blundell, Cabinet Member for a Thriving Economy |
| Report Author | Ryan Killeen |
| Public/Private Document | Public |

| | | |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Application: 20/00219/HOUS | Township: Rochdale | Ward: Castleton |
| Appeal Reference: APP/P4225/D/20/3256054 | | Decision level: Delegated |
| Site Address: 65 Bolton Road, Rochdale, OL11 3NG | | |
| Proposal: Two storey side and single storey side extension, first floor rear extension (re-submission of 19/00528/HOUS) | | |
| Applicant: Mr Asif Khan | | Agent: Mr Jeffrey Goodchild |
| Planning Inspectorate Decision: Appeal Dismissed – 26 January 2021 | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The application was refused due to the impact the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area as a result of multiple poor design features. This was considered contrary to the Council's <i>Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD</i>, policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the NPPF. – The Inspector acknowledged the guidance in the Council's <i>Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document</i> encourages roof designs that minimise the impact of any extension on their neighbours, but also requires that extensions or alterations should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it. – The Inspector stated that the use of a hipped roof form on the proposed development would represent an incongruous feature as the host property utilises a gabled roof. The visual harm identified was not considered to be overcome by the proposed setback from the highway. – The Inspector concluded that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the site and the character of the surrounding area and that this was contrary to the design, character and appearance aims of Policies DM1, P3 of the Council's Core Strategy 2016, the SPD and the NPPF. – Other matters included the appellant's reference to a number of other properties on Bolton Road. The Inspector stated that the fact any other development may exist is not a reason to allow otherwise unacceptable development. | | |