



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 May 2021 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/21/3269412

35 Stamford Drive, Failsworth, M35 9WS

- 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 Anthony Wardleworth against the decision of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PA/345084/20, dated 6 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as extending an existing bungalow in height to create a first floor space, with a new entrance area, as well as extending the existing garage at the front and the rear.
-

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 main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The street has a mix of bungalows and two-storey detached properties, which are arranged in distinct groups. The appeal property is in the middle of a group of seven bungalows and is prominently sited at the junction of Stamford Drive with Ashbridge Road, where it is in full view of those travelling up Ashbridge Road.
 5. Although some of the bungalows have accommodation at first floor level such accommodation is largely contained within the roofspace, and the properties have maintained their single storey appearance. Overall, the bungalows generally have a cohesive appearance and rhythm which makes a significant contribution to the character of the area.
 6. The proposal would see the bungalow extended upwards to create a first floor. Both the ridge and eaves levels would be significantly increased, and together with the proposed half-hip roof form the dwelling would have the appearance of a two-storey dwelling when viewed from the front. As such the resulting
-

building would not reflect the form and massing of its neighbours. Consequently, the extension would be discordant with the group of bungalows and the wider street scene and would detract from its character and appearance.

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to the size and scale of other upward extensions which have been undertaken to bungalows within the street, and which it is contended are comparable schemes to the appeal proposal.
8. The alterations at No 2 Stamford Drive have retained the appearance of a bungalow, and furthermore the property has two-storey dwellings on all sides. Its context is not directly comparable to the appeal property. Nos 29 and 31 Stamford Drive, at one end of the group of bungalows that includes the appeal property, have a higher ridge height than the other bungalows in the group but they retain the appearance of bungalows. The adjacent property at No 27 is a two-storey dwelling, and therefore the increased ridge height at Nos 29 and 31 acts as a transition between the bungalows and two-storey dwellings.
9. The previous extensions and alterations at Nos 33, 37 and 41 Stamford Drive clearly differ from the appeal proposal before me as they do not include an increase in the ridge height. As such they are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme. In any case, I have considered this appeal on its own merits.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policies 9 and 20 of the of the Development Plan Document – Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2011), which both seek to ensure that development is of a high quality design that does not have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

11. Having had regard to all matters raised, I find that there are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR