

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2022 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/21/3284272

Former Breakthrough City Church, Ripon Street, Ashton-Under-Lyne, OL6 9PD

- 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 M Seddon against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00796/FUL, dated 24 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is extension to form first floor and roof to existing single storey dwelling.
-

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 proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework) states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. At paragraph 134 it sets out that development that is not well designed should be refused where it fails to reflect local design policies.
5. The host property is a single storey building recently converted from a church to a dwelling in a prominent location within the street scene. The building has a large footprint, but its single storey form provides a sense of openness and visual relief to the otherwise tightly knit residential area within which it is located.
6. The proposal would significantly increase the scale and massing of the property and would result in an overbearing addition with the resultant building being significantly larger than nearby development. This would be significantly at odds with the local vernacular. As a consequence, the extended dwelling would

be an unduly prominent and dominant addition in the street scene. The proposal would erode the sense of openness that the current property provides to the locality. The part single storey nature of the scheme is noted but this does not provide mitigation for the identified harm.

8. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies C1 and H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan (2004) which together seek to ensure that development is of high quality and sympathetic to local character. It would also conflict with policies RED1 and RED7 of the Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (2010) which seeks to ensure that the scale and mass of dwellings is not significantly altered by an extension and that an increased roof height should not create a building of unacceptable scale for its surroundings or detract from the character of the area. The proposal also conflicts with the design aims of the Framework.

Other Matters

7. I note the support for the proposal, however this does not outweigh the harm the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the area. In addition, the absence of third party objections to the proposal is a neutral matter in my considerations.
8. The appellant has referred to a large building in the vicinity of the appeal site. Whilst I do not have the details of this before me, I note that it is not in a residential use and therefore not comparable to the appeal proposal.
9. I note the appellant's concerns regarding the Council's handling of the case. However, this is a matter that would need to be taken up with the Council in the first instance. In determining this appeal, I am only able to have regard to the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR