

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2017

**by Helen Cassini BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 26 April 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/17/3168240**

**30 Arncliffe Rise, Pennine Meadows, Moorside OL4 2LZ**

- 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 Mrs C J Maders against the decision of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref: HH/339013/16, dated 8 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2016.
  - The development proposed is a front porch.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is a red brick, mid-terrace house, set back from the highway and has a modest front garden. Arncliffe Rise comprises of five blocks of terraced properties, with each block having four houses. The appeal site is constructed from red brick and has a modest front garden. The end properties of each of the terraces have pitched roof gables, with the first floor section being clad with dark timber panels and a light render. The immediate area is predominantly residential in nature.
  4. The front entrances of the end of terrace properties are sited on the side elevations, with the middle properties having their front entrances facing the highway. Most of the mid-terrace properties have small front canopies located above the front doors and living room windows. The majority of window frames and front doors are of a dark brown finish.
  5. The appellant has referenced 36 Arncliffe Rise, which has undergone some refurbishment. As a result, No 36 has a larger, more prominent canopy above the front door and living room window. In addition, the front door and window frames have been replaced with white units. However, apart from the alterations made to No 36, the terrace which the appeal site forms part of, and the adjacent terraces have undergone no other significant alterations. As such, a general sense of symmetry and balance is evident within the immediate street scene.
-

6. Despite being constructed from sympathetic materials, the proposed porch would disrupt the general symmetry between both the host terrace and adjoining terraces as a whole. This loss of symmetry would be evident from Arncliffe Rise on the approach to the site in both directions. As the only example of such an arrangement within the terrace in the street scene to which No 30 belongs, the proposal would be an obtrusive and discordant element in the context of the host terrace and wider street scene.
7. In support of their appeal the appellants have drawn my attention to the fact that a porch with a reduced scale and mass would benefit from permitted development rights. There would appear to be a reasonable possibility that such an extension may be implemented should the appeal scheme not proceed. This is therefore a fallback position to which I give significant weight.
8. Both parties agree that the appeal proposal would be modest in scale, and there is no evidence before me which leads me to disagree. However, for the proposal to utilise permitted development rights, the overall footprint would need to be reduced by approximately 0.64 square metres and the height reduced by some 0.7 square metres. Whilst a loss of symmetry within the host terrace and wider street scene would still result, a further reduction in footprint and height would assist in creating a more resolved appearance within the wider terrace. Accordingly, the permitted scheme would not appear as substantial as the appeal proposal before me. Thus, it is considered that the appeal proposal is more harmful than the fallback position.
9. Whilst reasonably localised in its extent, the effect of the proposal would be to unacceptably diminish the character and appearance of the host property with subsequent harm to the character and appearance of the wider terrace and street scene. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies 9 and 20 of the Oldham Local Development Framework, Development Plan Document – Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2011. When taken together these policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that new development achieves a high standard of design and layout, and is compatible with the character of locality.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Helen Cassini*

INSPECTOR