



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2021 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/20/3262134
46 Taunton Road, Chadderton OL9 0BE

- 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 Miss Mahbuba Begum against the decision of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HH/344957/20, dated 8 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as two/single storey extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No. 46 relates to a two-storey link-detached property located on a corner plot. Within the surrounding area there are a mix of semi-detached, link-detached and detached properties constructed of brick with a gable roof.
5. The appeal site is well screened by the existing boundary hedge. The gap to the side of the property contributes positively to the area because it provides a sense of spaciousness within a built-up area. Corner plots within the surrounding area generally have relatively large side gardens.
6. The materials, fenestration and roof style would match that of the existing dwelling. However, the extension would not appear subordinate to the original dwelling due to a combination of its width, lack of set back and proposed ridge height. Consequently, it would represent a disproportionately large extension with a scale and volume similar to the host property.
7. The scheme would erode the majority of the space to the side of the property and would reduce the sense of spaciousness of both the site and surrounding

- area. The hedge would partially screen the development but particularly the first floor would be visible from the highway. In any event, there is no guarantee that the hedge would remain at its current height in perpetuity. Therefore, on account of its scale and massing, the extension would result in a dominant addition to the street scene in close proximity to Wells Avenue.
8. The appellant asserts that the extension has been designed to reflect that of the semi-detached properties within the street scene. Semi-detached properties within the surrounding area clearly read as two separate dwellings given the intervening boundary treatment, driveways and minor appearance variations such as window designs and porches. In contrast, the scheme would clearly read as one out of character, large property rather than as a pair of semi-detached properties. Accordingly, the scheme would compromise the character and appearance of the area on account of its siting, design, width and scale which would appear at odds with the established pattern of development.
 9. The appellant has drawn my attention to extensions within the local area. Little information is before me with regards to those extensions. I observed on my site visit that generally extensions respect the proportions of the host property and side extensions to corner plots maintained the sense of spaciousness due to their scale and massing. For example, No. 37 Norwich Avenue, to the rear of the appeal site, has a single storey side extension which respects the width of the host dwelling and is set back from the principal elevation. The extension does not result in a dominant addition and does not unduly compromise the spaciousness of the corner plot because of its scale and massing. The extensions highlighted do not represent justification for harmful development at the appeal site and each application must be determined on its individual merits.
 10. For these reasons, the proposed development would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policies 9 and 20 of the Oldham Local Development Framework Development Plan Document – Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2011). These policies collectively seek, amongst other matters, to promote high quality design which does not have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding area.

Other Considerations

11. I acknowledge that the proposal would provide additional living space for the appellant's household, would not cause harm to the living conditions of existing occupants and would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. However, personal circumstances will seldom outweigh more general planning considerations, and these are not matters that outweigh the harm that would be caused by the development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree and conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR