



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2022

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/22/3305052

1 Hill Close, Oldham, Greater Manchester, OL4 5EU

- 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 Arshed against the decision of Oldham Council.
 - The application Ref HOU/349064/22, dated 13 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and rear ground floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene and the area. The development plan includes policies 9 and 20 of the Oldham Local Development Framework Development Plan Document – Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2011) which together seek to ensure that development is of a high quality and does not have a significant adverse effect on the visual amenity of the area. The National Planning Policy Framework has a similar objective.
3. 1 Hill Close is an end terrace two storey dwelling likely to have been built in the inter-war period and located on the corner of Hill Close and Tyndall Street within a residential area of terraced streets. The dwelling is one of four other similar dwellings which are sited on corner plots adjoining Tyndall Street which are set back from the street behind side gardens. Ground levels rise away from Tyndall Street on this side of the road and the dwellings are sited at a higher ground level than the street, giving them some prominence in the street scene. These dwellings contrast with the Victorian terraced houses on the opposite side of Tyndall Street whose side elevations abut the footway at the same ground level. The set back and side garden of 1 Hill Close and the other similar dwellings bring a sense of openness and greenery to this side of the street which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of this otherwise densely built up area.
4. The proposal includes a two storey side extension which would be set back from the front wall of the dwelling and would have a hipped roof to match that of the main roof with a lower ridge height. A single storey ground floor

extension with a single pitch roof would be sited across the whole of the resulting rear elevation.

5. Although the size and scale of the proposed development would be subservient to the existing dwelling, its siting on the side elevation would disrupt the strong building line on Tyndall Street. The size and scale of the proposal in this location would introduce a large mass of building which would be very close to the side boundary at some 0.8m distance. This would appear unduly dominant when seen from Tyndall Street and would significantly reduce the openness of the appeal site and the street scene, thereby causing harm to the visual amenity of the area.
6. The other examples of similar proposals referred to by the appellant differ from this site. 20 Skipton Street is a semi-detached dwelling on a corner plot but is located within a less built-up street in which there is a much greater sense of openness from front gardens and grass verges. Its side garden therefore makes less of a contribution to the character and appearance of the area than in this case. 16 Hill Close is an end terrace dwelling of a similar style at the top of Hill Close with a generous side garden. It is not sited on a junction and the approved development results in a larger remaining area of side garden than would be the case here. I am not persuaded then that those examples are directly comparable or provide a precedent that would outweigh the harm I have identified.
7. The appellant has provided details of his family's personal circumstances and the wish to provide accommodation for elderly family members. Whilst I have some sympathy with that, I have no evidence that would indicate a sufficiently compelling need for the scheme proposed here and that there is no alternative means of providing it. This matter does not, therefore, outweigh the harm that would be caused by this proposal.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development, by reason of its siting, size and scale, would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the street scene and the area. It would be contrary to the development plan policies referred to earlier and there are no material considerations that would outweigh this. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector