



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2022

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/22/3293660

2 High Grove Road, Oldham, OL4 4HG

- 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 Neil Oliver against the decision of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HOU/346501/21, dated 19 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is an outbuilding/garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on highway safety; and the effect of the proposal on the appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. Number 2 High Grove Road is a detached dwelling, which is situated in a predominantly residential area. The design, scale and appearance of properties in the vicinity of the appeal site vary and there is no distinctive or predominant character to the area.
4. High Grove Road is a narrow road with a series of bends and narrow footways. The appeal property is relatively close to the junction with the A670, Mossley Road, which is one of the main roads in the area.
5. The proposal is to construct a detached garage/outbuilding in the rear/ side garden of the dwelling. It would also involve engineering works in terms of alterations to the ground levels and construction of a driveway. The development also includes a flat-roofed dormer. The external materials would match the existing dwelling.
6. There is no off-street parking for the property and occupants of the property currently park on High Grove Road.

Highway Safety

7. The Council states that the proposal would not provide sufficient turning and manoeuvring space to enable vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear. It contends that the reversing movements to and from High Grove Road would present an unacceptable hazard to other road users and pedestrians. As

such, the proposal would conflict with Development Management Policy 9 of the adopted Oldham Local Plan (LP). This policy seeks to ensure (amongst other things) that development does not harm the safety of road users.

8. I accept that the proposed space in front of the garage/outbuilding would be restricted in terms of its depth and overall area. Consequently, it is likely that reversing movements to and from the highway would be necessary. However, the current parking arrangements also involve vehicle manoeuvring and turning in order to ensure that they can fit into relatively tight spaces and face in the direction of intended travel. I also observed at my site visit two instances where vehicles were required to wait close to the junction with Mossley Road in order that oncoming vehicles on High Grove Road could pass. In my opinion, this was hazardous and the reduction in on-street parking would be a benefit in that regard.
9. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude on this issue that the proposal would not increase the risk to the safety of road users or pedestrians and there would be no conflict with Development Management Policy 9 of the LP.

Streetscene

10. The proposal includes the construction of front facing flat-roofed dormer. The appellant states that it would provide space for home-working. I noted at my site visit that there is a dormer on the existing dwelling and on others in the locality. However, the proposed dormer would occupy most of the front roof area of the building, covering most of its width and adjoining the ridge. It would be particularly dominant when approaching towards the property from the east and it would appear visually incongruous, out of scale with the building and harmful to the appearance of the streetscene.
11. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Development Management Policies 9 and 20 of the LP, which seek to ensure (amongst other things) that development does not harm the visual appearance of the area and is of high-quality design. These policies are consistent with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, which also requires development to add to the overall quality of the area and be visually attractive.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above in relation to character and appearance, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR