

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	8 April 2021
Portfolio	Councillor John Blundell, Cabinet Member for a Thriving Economy
Report Author	Emily Sykes
Public/Private Document	Public

<b>Application:</b> 20/00629/FUL	<b>Township:</b> Rochdale	<b>Ward:</b> Norden
<b>Appeal Reference:</b> APP/P4225/D/20/3259977		<b>Decision level:</b> Delegated
<b>Site Address:</b> 12 Nordale Park, Rochdale, OL12 7RS		
<b>Proposal:</b> Two storey rear extension, construction of pitched roof over existing flat roof garage, extending to provide covered area to side entrance, alterations to fenestration on existing front elevation and new window opening on existing side elevation at first floor		
<b>Applicant:</b> Mr and Mrs Norton		<b>Agent:</b> Mr Phil Corns
<b>Planning Inspectorate Decision:</b> Appeal Dismissed – 8 March 2021		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The main issues with the proposed development were in relation to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area and the impact of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers at no.19 Ellis Fold.</li> <li>– The inspector found that the proposed development would not respect the proportions of the host dwelling, as it appears a continuation of the property rather than as a subordinate addition. The inspector also found that the extension would reduce the sense of spaciousness, which makes a positive contribution to the character of the surrounding area. The scheme would appear conspicuous from the highway and would be a prominent and unsympathetic addition.</li> <li>– The inspector found that the development would not comply with the minimum space standards outlined in the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD in relation to no.19 Ellis Fold, a bungalow located to the rear of the appeal site. The proposed height, scale and proximity of the development along with the change in levels would result in the outlook from no.19 being considerably compromised, with the proposed development having an intrusive and oppressive effect to the neighbouring rear garden.</li> <li>– The inspector took into account other considerations, which were in regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty, of which one of the appellants has a protected characteristic. However, the inspector noted that there is no evidence that the appellants' need could only be catered for in an extension of the configuration proposed. The inspector found that whilst the equality implications carry weight in support of the proposal, this would not be outweighed by the harm which would be caused to the character of the area and the neighbouring occupiers' living conditions.</li> <li>– For these reasons, the appeal was dismissed.</li> </ul>		