
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022

by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/W/21/3282408

53A Main Road, Oldham, OL9 6JY

- 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 Nanu Miah against the decision of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref FUL/346864/21, dated 8 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located at the end of a residential terrace and occupies a corner plot that widens to the rear. The ground floor is currently a shop with offices on the upper floors, and a hairdressers is located at the rear in what was originally the garage. The property has previously been extended by way of various ground floor extensions that cover most, but not all of the plot, and a smaller first floor extension.
4. The surrounding area is a relatively densely developed predominantly residential area, comprising a mix of older terraced properties as well as more modern housing. However, there are a small number of commercial uses within the area.
5. A first floor extension is proposed to provide additional office space. This would have a contemporary design with a flat roof and large areas of glazing. It would cover the entire plot, including the existing small open area between the hairdressers and the offices. As such, it would add a considerable mass and bulk to the property.
6. Although in commercial use, at present the building still retains its domestic scale and character. The considerable scale and mass of the proposed extension, and the extensive areas of glazing would not respect this domestic character. Moreover, the flat roof would not sit comfortably alongside the hipped roof of the main building

7. Whilst a small number of other properties in the terrace have had some rear extensions, these are generally limited in scale. As a result, the addition of such a large first floor extension on this property would be an incongruous and unsympathetic addition to the terrace.
8. The site occupies a prominent location, being clearly visible for some distance when travelling in either direction along Prospect Road, and in a south-westerly direction along Main Road. In these views, the mass and bulk of the proposal would mean it would be a discordant and imposing feature in the street scene.
9. Therefore, I consider that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. Accordingly, it would conflict with policies 9 and 20 of the *Oldham Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Development Plan Document (adopted November 2011)* which require that developments have a high quality of design that reflect the local character and do not have a significant adverse impact on the visual amenity of the area.

Other Matters

10. It is suggested by the appellant that the extension is necessary to allow the continued viability of the building. However, I have been provided with no evidence to show that the building as it currently operates is unviable or why an extension of this size is necessary to make it viable.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR