



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2023

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/23/3323532

110 Higher House Close, Chadderton, Oldham OL9 8LP

- 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 Saeed Tariq Chowhan against the decision of Oldham Council.
 - The application Ref HOU/350747/23, dated 28 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is a front, rear and side dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The host property comprises one half of a semi-detached, hipped-roofed, two storey pair. I observed on my visit that the houses in the area are typically arranged in semi-detached pairs or terraces, which are no more than two storeys high, and which have a hipped or gabled roof form, with plain roof slopes. These characteristics, along with the buildings' red brick finish, gives the local area a significant sense of consistency and cohesion.
4. The scheme would include front and rear facing box dormers, which would extend from around the eaves of the host to its ridge, along with a side dormer which would cover most of that roof. Consequently, they would dominate the host's roofscape, with little of the existing sloping roof remaining visible, and the resultant property would have a significant second floor mass and a very rectilinear roof form.
5. That form and mass would be markedly at odds with the typically two storey high buildings, with plain sloping roofs, which typify the immediate area. The scheme would also unbalance the appearance of this semi-detached pair. Whilst the cladding on the proposed dormers would match the colour of the existing roof tiles, the windows' lack of alignment with those in the floors beneath, would emphasize the scheme's discordant appearance.

6. Although the appellant refers to a bungalow on Scholes Street, it forms no part of this streetscene, and in any event its front-facing dormer is set well up from the eaves, and much more of that property's original form therefore remains legible, and it does not appear as top-heavy, compared to this proposal.
7. In this prominent crossroads location, the proposed development would very significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Consequently, it would conflict with those parts of Policies 9 and 20 of the Oldham Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD (2011) which require proposals to be of high-quality design, which reflects the character and distinctiveness of local areas, and which does not have an adverse visual impact on the local townscape. It would also conflict with the broadly similar approach to good design at Part 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework').

Other matters

8. Given that the proposed rear dormer would broadly face the largely blank side wall and roof of 3 Selkirk Road, and that the host has existing first floor windows in this elevation, the scheme would not increase overlooking of that property to a significant degree.
9. Although the appellant refers to permitted development rights, this scheme requires planning permission. The appellant is dissatisfied that he was not given the chance to amend his application. However, I have dealt with the scheme before me on its planning merits.
10. I understand that there is a pressing need for extra accommodation for this locally-established, growing family; and that financial costs rule out a house move. The Framework does support providing a high standard of amenity, and the scheme would enable the occupants to make the most of their existing house.
11. However, the benefit that would arise from the improvement to this family's quality of life, does not outweigh the very significant and lasting harm that the scheme would cause to the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
12. For the above reasons, the proposal would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. Consequently, having regard to all other matters raised, including a representation in favour, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR