

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	18 March 2021
Portfolio	Councillor John Blundell, Cabinet Member for a Thriving Economy
Report Author	Emily Sykes
Public/Private Document	Public

<b>Application:</b> 20/00541/HOUS	<b>Township:</b> Pennines	<b>Ward:</b> Wardle and West Littleborough
<b>Appeal Reference:</b> APP/ P4225/D/20/3260706		<b>Decision level:</b> Delegated
<b>Site Address:</b> 32 Shore Mount, Littleborough, OL15 8EW		
<b>Proposal:</b> Three storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory, installation of window to side elevation and increase in height of roof		
<b>Applicant:</b> Mr Dawson	<b>Agent:</b> James Campbell Associates Ltd	
<b>Planning Inspectorate Decision:</b> Appeal Dismissed – 26 January 2021		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The application was refused due to the effect that the proposed development would have upon the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.</li> <li>– Due to the topography of Shore Mount, the appeal property sits approximately 0.5m higher than the neighbouring No.30. The proposed increase in roof ridge results in the appeal property sitting approximately 1.6m higher than the neighbouring dwelling.</li> <li>– The inspector found that the proposed development would appear conspicuous in a prominent position an uncharacteristic gap between the top of the first floor windows and eaves. The inspector stated that the increased ridge height would result in an elongated property which is unbalanced in its proportions.</li> <li>– The inspector noted that the ridge height would appear much greater than the other properties within the terrace and wider area, in particular looking at the difference between the appeal property and no.30. As a results of this, the inspector concluded that the host property would appear unduly prominent.</li> <li>– Other matters included providing additional living space for the appellant and their family and no objections being received from neighbouring properties. The inspector considered that these matters did not outweigh the harm that would be caused by the development. The appellant also asserted that the Council did not work proactively but the inspector concluded that the evidence presented showed that the Council did engage and that this does not impact the planning merits of the case.</li> <li>– The inspector concluded that the proposal would conflict with Policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy, the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.</li> </ul>		