

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	5 August 2021
Portfolio	Councillor John Blundell, Cabinet Member for Economy and Communications
Report Author	Majid Mir
Public/Private Document	Public

Application: 20/01119/HOUS	Township: Pennines	Ward: Littleborough Lakeside
Appeal Reference: APP/P4225/D/21/3266642		Decision level: Delegated
Site Address: 1 Dale View Littleborough OL15 0BP		
Proposal: First floor side extension and single storey rear extension, along with replacement of existing front porch and application of render		
Applicant: Mr Simon Hill		Agent: Mr Russell Woods
Planning Inspectorate Decision: Appeal Dismissed – 6 July 2021		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The main issues with the proposed development were the scale of the proposed development and the harm caused to the host dwelling and street scene. The inspector only looked at the proposed first floor side extension. – The inspector noted that 1 Dale View and the neighbouring properties were built with the same original design. The inspector noted that many neighbouring properties had extensions but these kept the original character and ‘form a rhythm and pattern in the street scene’ providing a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. – The inspector noted that the space surrounding the dwelling contributed the generally low density feeling of the estate and creates a sense of openness. The inspector believed this was evident on other corner plots in the immediate vicinity and considered it a positive feature of the area. The inspector believed the addition of the proposed extension would have a harmful effect on the open character of the estate. – The inspector noted that the extension would have been almost the same width as the main dwelling and would be set back from the main front elevation of the dwelling by only a limited distance. This would, according to the inspector, substantially increase the bulk of the building, would fail to respect the proportions of the main dwelling and would add substantial mass to the dwelling. Additionally, the overall scale and the design of the fenestration would result in an excessively elongated dwelling and therefore the proportions would not respect the modest scale of the original dwelling. – The inspector believed due to the design of the fenestration, it would result in an expanse of render that would not be in keeping with the existing ratio of render around the windows. – The appeal identified other side extensions in the vicinity, however the inspector was not certain on the circumstances of when these extensions obtained permission or the planning policy position at the time. Nevertheless, the inspector believed the examples provided better respected the proportions of the original dwellings and were designed so that the fenestration and materials were in keeping. Furthermore, the inspector noted the scale of developments on corner plots within the surrounding area generally maintained the spacious feel of the estate. – The appeal was dismissed as the proposed first floor side extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene in conflict policies DM1 and P3 of the Core Strategy and would fail to accord with paragraph 5.1 of the 		

Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD. The inspector pointed to the requirements of the Core Strategy policies for developments to be of high quality design which contribute positively to the townscape and enhance the quality of the area.