

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



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

Application: 20/01509/HOUS	Township: Middleton	Ward: North Middleton
Appeal Reference: APP/P4225/D/21/3269648		Decision level: Delegated
Site Address: 7 Tennyson Road, Middleton, M24 2WR		
Proposal: First floor rear extension with Juliet balcony and alteration of windows on ground floor rear elevation		
Applicant: Mr Glynn Meredith		Agent: Endaf Roberts
Planning Inspectorate Decision: Appeal Dismissed – 5 July 2021		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The main issues with the proposed development were the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene. – The inspector found that the properties in the street have a cohesive appearance and rhythm which makes a significant contribution to the character of the street. – The inspector noted that due to the appeal property occupying a corner plot it is positioned at an angle to the street, with the side elevation of the property clearly visible from public vantage points. – The inspector found that there are no other flat roofs visible in the street, and as such the box-like proportions of the proposed flat roof would be unsympathetic to the existing hipped roofs and the general profile of houses within the estate. It was noted that there has been little attempt to provide a sympathetic roof profile that would reflect the original design of the dwelling. – Other examples of flat roofs were provided by the appellant which that inspector noted that one was not directly comparable and the appeal has been determined under its own merits. The inspector noted that the existence of poor design elsewhere does not serve as justification for further harmful development, particularly having regard to the need to comply with current planning policies. – As such, the inspector noted that the proposal would conflict with policies DM1 and P3 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which requires development to be of a high-quality design that contributes positively to the townscape and enhances the quality of the area. The proposal also failed to accord with the guidance in paragraph 5.1 of the Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document, which states that house extensions should be in keeping with the host property. For these reasons, the appeal was dismissed. 		