The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2020

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/20/3250219
8 Elgin Road, Glodwick, Oldham OL4 1QQ

- 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 S Amin against the decision of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref HH/344110/19, dated 23 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 January 2020.
- The development proposed is proposed rear dormer and a new gable wall.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description and address of the development provided on the planning application form have been replaced by amended versions on the decision notice and in subsequent appeal documents. I consider those subsequent versions to accurately reflect the proposal and I have therefore used them within this decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a dwelling at the end of a terrace of properties. The existing building has a hipped roof, and it is proposed to change this to a gable roof to enable the construction of a rear dormer. Due to its location at the end of the terrace and adjacent to an access lane, the side elevation of the property is relatively prominent within the streetscape.

5. The terraces in the immediate vicinity of the site are terminated by hipped roofed dwellings. However, due to the length of the terrace containing the appeal site, the hipped roof form is not a defining characteristic of the terrace. I also saw that there was some variation in roof designs in the wider area, including gable roofs on the terrace to the rear of the appeal site and on more recent development in the area. Within this context, I consider that the proposed gable roof would not appear unduly out of character with the host building or the area.

6. However, the proposed dormer would be constructed with a side wall flush with the gable. The angular extent of brickwork projecting above the perceived roof slope would appear as a stark and obtrusive feature which would give the resulting building an incongruous and top-heavy character. Due to the end of terrace location, this unsympathetic addition to the property would be readily visible from the public realm. Whilst this specific design may not be expressly prohibited by planning policy, the effect on character and appearance is a matter of planning judgement and the lack of a prescriptive policy does not lead me to a different conclusion in respect of the harm arising from the proposal.

7. The appellant has referred to a number of other properties in the area which are of a similar design. However, I have not been provided with details of the circumstances that led to these developments gaining approval, and in any event they served to confirm the unacceptable appearance of this roof design. Whilst nearby dormers may project in close proximity to side gables, even a limited set-back can break up views of the side elevation and mitigate the potential harm arising from bulky dormer extensions at roof level.

8. Notwithstanding my conclusions in respect of the proposed gable roof, I conclude that the use of a flush side wall for the dormer would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the design and visual amenity requirements of Policies 9 and 20 of the Oldham Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2011. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework with regards to achieving well-designed places.

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

David Cross

INSPECTOR