

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2016

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 06 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/16/3159782

3 Mildred Avenue, Grotton, Oldham OL4 5SQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr P Stott against the decision of Oldham Council.
 - The application Ref HH/338761/16, dated 21 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension to the side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The Council are concerned that the extension, because it would project beyond the established building line of the dwellings on the northern side of Middleway, would introduce an unduly conspicuous feature into the street scene. I am not satisfied that the extension would be viewed in association with the properties to the rear. However, although retaining a gap, it would extend relatively close to the side boundary and the footway along Middleway. This together with its two storey height, would result in it being a highly conspicuous new feature.
 4. The extension has been designed to reflect the form of the property and its limited depth would reduce its overall impact. However, it would present a featureless elevation to the side which would be particularly prominent as the property is set at a higher level than the pavement. As the extension would have the same front building line as the dwelling, this would increase the perceived overall scale of the frontage rather than the addition being subservient to its overall form. This element of the design, together with the scale, overall height and proximity of the extension to the side boundary, would result in harm to the existing relatively open character and appearance of this corner plot.
 5. The proposal would fail to comply with the provisions of Policies 9 (iv) and 20 of the Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2011 as it would have an adverse impact on the visual amenity and the character of the area. As these policies generally accord with the
-

design requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, I afford them considerable weight.

6. I acknowledge that the neighbouring property, 5 Mildred Avenue, has been extended to the side but as the extension is single storey, it does not have the same impact on the openness of this corner. I have also had regard to the extension at 3 Hillside Avenue. That addition is set below the level of the road and only the front corner lies close to the pavement. The extension at 2 Middleway, although of a similar form, has limited prominence as it is not set on a corner plot. These extensions are not therefore directly comparable.
7. I have had regard to the shortcomings of the existing third bedroom and the requirements of the appellant's growing family. I also acknowledge the lack of objections raised by third parties and the support offered by the Parish Council. Whilst these matters provide some weight in favour of the proposal, it is not sufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR