



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2017

by Peter D Biggers BSc Hons MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/16/3167513

9 Nudger Green, Dobcross, Oldham, Lancs OL3 5AW

- 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 Edward Middleton against the decision of Oldham Council.
 - The application Ref HH/338948/16, dated 15 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is first floor bedroom extension over existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surroundings in Nudger Green.

Reasons

3. Nudger Green is a modern estate of mainly detached houses in stone, render and tile. The houses on the southern side of the road are 2 storey detached whilst those on the north side are generally single storey. The section of Nudger Green where the appeal site is located between Nos 1 and 17 are all built to the same design with the main house comprising 2 storeys on a broadly north-south axis with a single storey section accommodating the entrance and double garage at right angles to the main house. There is therefore an attractive uniformity to the front elevations of the properties in this section of Nudger Green which is largely free from extensions visible from the street frontage.
 4. The height and mass of the extension constructed over the full length of the garage would result in a significant change to the character and design of the existing property where the main house would no longer be dominant. Despite the slight step down at the ridge and the existing setback from the main house frontage the scale of the extension would fail to appear subordinate to the host dwelling. The proposal would therefore have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling.
 5. It has been put to me that the extension has been designed to complement the existing dwelling and the set-back would ensure the proposal would be in keeping with the house and surroundings. However the scale, height and blank design of the frontage to the proposed first floor would negate the effect of the set-back and, considered in views along Nudger Green, the extension would appear
-

dominant, intrusive and out of keeping with the uniform design of the other properties on the south side of Nudger Green.

6. The *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) attaches great importance to seeking a high quality of design. At Paragraph 64 it states that “..permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available to improve the character and quality of an area”. Policy 9 of the *Oldham Council Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD*(JCSDMP) is consistent with the Framework in ensuring development does not have a significant adverse impact on visual amenity of the surrounding area. Moreover JCSDMP policy 20 requires that development takes into account local character and the need for well-designed buildings.
7. For the reasons above these policy objectives would not be met by the proposal. The extension would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and erode the uniform and rhythmic character of the south side of Nudger Green contrary to the Framework and JCSDMP policies 9 and 20.
8. Whilst I understand that the appellant is seeking to create additional living space to make sustainable and effective use of an existing home, an objective which is encouraged by the Framework, I am not persuaded that this social benefit outweighs the harm to the character and appearance of the property and its surroundings that would be caused if I were to allow the appeal.

Conclusion

9. I have carefully considered the matters before me but for the reasons given the appeal should be dismissed.

P. D. Biggers

INSPECTOR