

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	7 October 2021
Portfolio	Councillor John Blundell, Cabinet Member for Economy and Communications
Report Author	Emily Sykes
Public/Private Document	Public

Application: 20/01431/HOUS	Township: Middleton	Ward: South Middleton
Appeal Reference: APP/P4225/D/21/3272404		Decision level: Delegated
Site Address: 7 Tennyson Road, Middleton, M24 2WR		
Proposal: 33 Dingle Road, Middleton, M24 1WF		
Applicant: Mrs Rachel McDermott		Agent: Mr Dave Trudgeon
Planning Inspectorate Decision: Appeal Dismissed – 5 July 2021		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The main issues with the proposed development were in relation to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, and the living conditions of no.2 Woodford Road with particular regard to privacy. – The inspector found that the host dwelling is prominent in the street scene and visible from several vantage points, due to its location on the junction between Dingle Road and Woodfield Road. The inspector noted that Dingle Road is characterised by dwellings with hipped roofs, giving a consistent rhythm to the street scene. – The inspector stated that the proposal would increase the roof height by approximately a metre such that it would be higher than the existing chimneys on the dwelling and change the roof from hip to gable. The size and scale of the two dormers would result in them being a dominant feature. – The inspector found that proposal would unbalance the property with the roof being a bulky feature which would not reflect the character of the host dwelling or surrounding properties. The inspector concluded that the contribution the extended dwelling would make to the appearance of the area would be eroded, resulting in harm to the surrounding area. – The inspector noted that whilst the windows in the proposed dormers would not overlook habitable rooms of the neighbouring dwelling, there would be overlooking into No.2s garden area as a result of the height of the dormer windows and the proximity of them to the boundary. – The inspector concluded that the proposed development is in conflict with the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD, policies P3 and DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the NPPF. For these reasons, the appeal was dismissed. 		