

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Date of Meeting | 2 September 2021 |
| Portfolio | Councillor John Blundell, Cabinet Member for Economy and Communications |
| Report Author | Emily Sykes |
| Public/Private Document | Public |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Application: 21/00105/CAA | Township: Heywood | Ward: Hopwood Hall |
| Appeal Reference: APP/P4225/D/21/3268593 | | Decision level: Delegated |
| Site Address: Hesketh Villa, Whittle Lane, Heywood, Rochdale, Lancashire, OL10 2RN | | |
| Proposal: Prior approval for upwards extension through addition of 1 no. storey, increasing maximum height by 2.0m to 7.15m | | |
| Applicant: Mr Joe Sedgley | | Agent: Mr Malcolm Percy |
| Planning Inspectorate Decision: Appeal Allowed – 11 August 2021 | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The main issue is whether the proposed development would constitute permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the GPDO. – Condition AA.2(2)(c) states that the roof pitch of the principal part of the dwellinghouse following the development must be the same as the roof pitch of the existing dwellinghouse. The GPDO sets out that for the purposes of Class AA, “principal part” in relation to a dwellinghouse means the main part of the dwellinghouse excluding any front, side or rear extension of a lower height, whether this forms part of the original dwellinghouse or is a subsequent addition. – The inspector noted that Hesketh Villa is a bungalow which currently has a mix of pitched roof designs and flat roof sections. The inspector noted that the Council found the proposed elevations to show the introduction of more conventional dual-pitched roofs which would introduce an entirely different roof form. This is due to roof planes at various points sloping in different directions than currently exist and ridges being introduced where they do not currently exist. – The inspector found that the proposal would result in a differently designed roof and the omission of the flat roof section. However, the inspector noted that the GPDO wording suggests a relatively narrow assessment as to the roof. The wording of the condition refers specifically to the roof pitch and does not states that the roof must have the same design, form, profile or direction as the existing roof pitch. As a result, the inspector concluded that the pitch of the roof would be the same as the roof pitch of the principal part of the existing dwellinghouse. – Overall, the inspector found that the scheme would result in a more coherent design and stated that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of external appearance. – The inspector noted that the Council do not raise any further issues with compliance with the GPDO within their submission and therefore for the reasons noted, the appeal was allowed and prior approval was granted. – An application for costs was made by the appellant against the Council but this | | |

refused by the inspector.