



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2023

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/23/3314299

8 Fernlea Avenue, Oldham OL1 2QH

- 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 Mrs Noorjahan Begum against the decision of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: HOU/349861/22 dated 23 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2022.
 - The application is for raising of roof to accommodate a new rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid terrace bay fronted, two storey house within a block of four similar houses that form a terrace within the cul de sac that is Fernlea Avenue. The appeal property is constructed of red brick with a later pantile roof. To the front of the property there is a parking area that is block paved providing parking and to the rear there is a rear lane giving access onto a garden and there is a pitched roof rear extension.
4. The scheme before me seeks retrospective planning permission for the erection of a rear dormer loft conversion which has resulted in a raising of the property's ridge by around 400mm. This raising in the ridge has been clad in a similar pantile material but runs at a slightly different pitch to that of the rest of the roof.
5. The dormer to the rear runs over almost the entire width of the appeal property and has seemingly been undertaken alongside that of its neighbour at number 6. The dormer is set back very slightly from the eaves and is clad in a dark coloured vertical UPVC cladding but otherwise extends across the roof of both properties.
6. In assessing this appeal I am aware of Policies 9 and 20 of the Council's Joint Development Plan Document (JDPD) that attempt to enhance a distinctive sense of place and the character and appearance of an area through proposals.

In this respect these policies reflect the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) in its intention to create beautiful and well designed buildings and places.

7. The scheme before me has caused some noticeable change to the character and appearance of the area through both raising the ridge of the roof and through the installation of a large dormer window that does not seemingly reflect the dominant traditional or local materials in its construction. As such the scheme has resulted in an overly large dormer window and this large scale and massing has made its appearance felt on the primary, most important, façade of the building, to its front.
8. In this case, the raise in ridge height has caused some harm, not perhaps so much through its presence, but more so by altering the pitch of the roof at this level, and through the rather poor execution of the roof cladding itself, which has made the alteration appeal clumsy and poorly designed.
9. Therefore, although I recognise that the street has both a mix of dwelling types and roof profiles, this variety tends to occur primarily due to the housetypes and due to the subtle raising in ground level at some places. This ultimately results in the ridges of houses being on slightly different levels but does not alter the overall character of the area in the way that this proposal does.
10. Ultimately I find significant harm caused through this proposal and that it has caused a noticeable and harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the area. This would lead me to the conclusion that Policies 9 and 20 of the JDPD have not been met and neither has the overriding policy guidance contained within The Framework. As such the appeal must fail.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR