

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



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

Application: 20/00922/FUL	Township: Middleton	Ward: East Middleton
Appeal Reference: APP/P4225/D/21/36264662		Decision level: Delegated
Site Address: 18 Eastfield Avenue, Middleton, M24 1DP		
Proposal: Change of use of land to domestic curtilage, erection of detached building for use as granny annex and formation of new vehicular access from Sunk Lane		
Applicant: Mr Rafal Machalinski		Agent: Barry Winterbottom
Planning Inspectorate Decision: Appeal Dismissed – 16 July 2021		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The application was refused on the basis that the proposed granny annex would not be ancillary in use by virtue of its size, separate access and number and type of rooms which could facilitate independent living, in addition to the impact on the character and appearance of the area, and to the living conditions of 69 and 71 Farmway and no.16 Eastfield Avenue. – The Inspector determined that despite the inclusion of features which would enable the building to be used independently of the main dwelling, use of the building as a granny annex, as described on the application form, could be controlled via a suitably worded condition. – In respect of the impact on the character of the area, the Inspector states that the large number of blank elevations and shallow roof pitch would detract from the features on surrounding properties. The inclusion of a large balcony was considered to further accentuate the contrast with surrounding properties and detract from the character of the area, and given that the building would be visible from nearby vantage points, have a harmful visual impact. – The Inspector did not consider that the proposed building would be unduly overbearing on or overshadow the gardens of 69 and 71 Farmway, due to the length of the rear gardens of these properties and the orientation of the building. The Inspector acknowledged that the proposed building would run close to the rear garden boundary of No. 16 Eastfield Avenue for a distance of 11.4m, however did not consider this to amount to an unacceptable overbearing impact given the length of no.16's garden which is also partly at a higher level. – The Inspector concluded that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to Policies P3 and DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy. Other considerations including the use of sustainable construction and sustainable drainage systems were not considered to outweigh the harm identified. Subsequently, the appeal was dismissed. 		