

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2017

**by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 23 October 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/17/3180159**  
**59 Tandle Hill Road, Royton OL2 5UX**

- 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 and Mrs Cashin against the decision of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref HH/340096/17, dated 18 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2017.
  - The development proposed is a two story side and rear extension and loft conversion.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

### Reasons

3. The two storey detached house is located on a wide, attractive tree lined suburban street. The area is characterised by a mixture of traditionally designed detached and semi-detached dwellings, generally constructed from red brick set within ample plots. The appeal dwelling has a distinctive design, featuring a curved double height window on the front elevation, twisting chimney stacks and gently flared eaves to the hipped roof.
4. The two storey side extension would feature a gable fronted pitched roof, predominantly glazed front and rear elevations, joined to the existing dwelling by a narrow flat roof glazed link. The two storey side extension also projects to the rear. The two storey rear extension features a flat roof, with projecting canopy to the side and rear at ground floor, timber clad and rendered walls, and floor to ceiling glazing. The roofing material is proposed to be standing seam coated steel. The proposal has a contemporary design.
5. The dwelling features a distinctive hipped roof, and the proposal would introduce a gable front pitched roof and flat roofed glazed link, that together with the significant amount of glazing, would appear incompatible with the existing dwelling. At first floor, the extension would also project slightly forward of the existing front elevation, and given its gable front, height, scale and projection beyond both the rear and front elevations of the host dwelling;

would appear as a dominant, incongruous and unduly strident feature to the existing traditionally designed dwelling.

6. The two storey rear extension would have an unsympathetic relationship with the host dwelling owing to the scale and bulk, but the flat roof element would also have an awkward and inharmonious junction due to its location above the eaves. Glimpsed views of the rear elevation are gained from both Tandle Wood Park and Woodland Park, which would increase the prominence of the proposal.
7. Finally, the use of different materials on the extension and the existing dwelling would serve to emphasise the incongruity of the extensions rather than having a unifying effect. Consequently, the prominence of the proposals, coupled with the incongruous design and material choice, would adversely affect the character and appearance of the existing building with consequent harm to the character and appearance and visual amenity of the surrounding area.
8. Whilst I appreciate that the scheme is intentionally a contemporary addition having been devised following detailed architectural research and drafting, and seeks to retain some traditional design features; in this instance I find that the overall design would not be complimentary to the existing site or positively contribute to a sense of place.
9. Thus, the proposal would not comply with Policies 9 and 20 of the Oldham Local Development Framework Development Plan Document – Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (November 2011). Together, these policies seek to promote high quality design that reflects the character and distinctiveness of the local area, protecting visual amenity.

### **Other Matters**

10. I have had regard to all of the details submitted as part of the appellant's case, which includes, amongst other things, justification for requiring the extension. I have paid particular attention to the matter regarding the appellant's daughter's mobility problems. However, I have been presented with no substantive evidence why this proposal would be specifically required. Accordingly, these other matters would not be sufficient to outweigh my findings on character and appearance.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Katie McDonald*

INSPECTOR