
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2017

by Gareth Wildgoose BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/W/16/3161191

16-18 Bridson Street, Oldham, Lancashire OL4 1NW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Shamroz against Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HH/337578/15, is dated 23 September 2015.
 - The development proposed is described as "a single storey extension at rear and construction of dormer".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council issued a decision notice on 8 December 2016 after the appeal was submitted which indicates that planning permission would have been refused if the application had proceeded to determination.
3. Notwithstanding the description of development provided on the application form, the submitted plans indicate that the proposal would include alterations to the roof of a two storey outrigger located to the rear of No 18 Bridson Street (No 18). This would consist of a reduction in the height and alteration of the roof pitch of the outrigger as shown on drg.no. SM-PP-03. A more accurate description of the development, therefore, would be a single storey rear extension and construction of rear dormer including alterations to the roof of an existing two storey rear outrigger. In determining this appeal I have taken account of those additional alterations as indicated in the submitted plans.
4. Further to the above, the Council has expressed concern in terms of the consistency, accuracy and detail of the submitted plans. I address those matters specifically as part of the main issue.

Main Issue

5. The main issue of this appeal is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, including regard to whether the submitted plans provide certainty in terms of the development proposed.

Reasons

6. The appeal site consists of a pair of mid-terrace properties located in a row on the south eastern side of Bridson Street. The properties are located towards the end of the terrace row where it meets Warcock Road and have an external
-

- appearance of 2 individual properties. However, a connecting room at ground floor level enables occupation of the properties as a single dwelling.
7. The character of the terraced row includes two storey outriggers with a shared rear gable design as an original feature. The outrigger of No 16 is linked to the neighbouring No 14 Bridson Street and the outrigger of No 18 is shared with the adjoining end terraced property addressed as No 14 Warcock Road. Land levels gradually rise towards Warcock Road, where the rear of the properties are visible in the gap separating the neighbouring terraced row which faces Fleet Street. Although there is a rear alleyway between these respective terraced rows, it is limited to private access only due to the presence of alley gates at both ends.
 8. Policies 9 and 20 of the Oldham Local Development Framework - Development Plan Document - Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (JCS&DMP), adopted November 2011 relate to local environmental quality, amenity and design principles. When taken together these policies seek to ensure that development is of a high quality design which reflects the character and distinctiveness of the local area and does not have a significant adverse impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding area.
 9. The appeal proposal is indicated on the submitted plans as including a rear dormer. There are inaccuracies between the submitted plans in terms of the design and proportions of the rear dormer. However, it is evident that the rear dormer would encompass a significant proportion of the roofslope of the main roof of No 18 in a similar manner to existing examples at Nos. 10 and 14 Bridson Street. The resultant visual effect would be a dominant addition of significant bulk and massing that would be at odds with the character of the host property. However, such a proposal would not appear out of place within the terrace row where large rear dormers are already a feature. Furthermore, there are also examples of properties which face Ronald Street and in the wider area where large rear dormers are a more prominent feature visible from public vantage points.
 10. Notwithstanding the above, the submitted plans also include roof alterations to the existing two storey shared outrigger with No 14 Warcock Road which would lower the ridge height and alter its roof slope. There are no existing examples of alterations to the roof slopes or proportions of shared rear outriggers along the terraced row. The rear outriggers have a characteristic regularity despite some differences in land levels, materials and the presence of chimneys. The proposal would unbalance the appearance of the gable of the two storey shared outrigger and would, therefore, disrupt the characteristic rhythm and proportions of shared outriggers along the terraced row. The effect would be visible from public vantage points along Warcock Road and from surrounding properties, and consequently, would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
 11. The single storey rear extension as proposed would not in itself be a prominent, bulky or harmful addition to the rear of the property. However, when viewed against the alterations to the adjoining outrigger, it would emphasise the incompatible and unbalanced nature of the shared outrigger.
 12. The application is accompanied by five submitted plans (SM-PP-01, SM-PP-02, SM-PP-03, SM-PP-04 and SM-PP-05). Based on the evidence before me and my observations of the site, the submitted plans are inaccurate and

contradictory in terms of the proposed height, proportions, pitch and design of the roof of the two storey outriggers, the design and proportions of the dormer proposed, window positions and the eaves height of the main roof of the dwelling. Irrespective of my previous findings, the inaccuracies within the submitted plans would not provide an appropriate level of certainty of the development proposed to grant planning permission. Such matters alone would justify dismissal of this appeal and could not be resolved by condition.

13. I conclude that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The submitted plans also do not provide the necessary certainty in terms of the development proposed. The proposal conflicts with Policies 9 and 20 of the JCS&DMP. The policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

14. The proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, as the extension would not project beyond the existing building line of the rear outriggers and there is adequate separation distances to properties at the rear. However, the absence of concern in that respect is a neutral factor.
15. The appellant has expressed concerns in terms of the Council's approach in dealing with the planning application and not making a decision before an appeal was submitted. However, those matters have no effect on the planning merits of the proposal before me or the outcome of this appeal.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above and taking all other matters into consideration, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed and planning permission should, therefore, be refused.

Gareth Wildgoose

INSPECTOR