



---

## 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: 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/23/3319574**  
**145 Broadway, Royton, Oldham OL2 5BW**

- 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 Asmina Begum against the decision of Oldham Council.
  - The application Ref FUL/349745/22, dated 6 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2023.
  - The development proposed is described as a double storey side extension, single storey rear extension, double storey front extension and dormer to the rear roof slope.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of the proposal in the banner above from the application form. However, based on amended drawing numbers BRO-02-20 Amendment 1A and BRO-03-20 Amendment 1A, whilst there would be a porch to the front, no two storey front extension is proposed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

4. The properties along this stretch of Broadway are set back from the wide road. There are some bungalows broadly opposite the site, whilst the host is the last in a row of regularly-spaced, semi-detached, two storey houses. This pair has a principally hipped roof form and subordinate single storey garages to the sides, but in many other respects, such as its two storey mass, its spacing, siting and red brick finish, it generally reflects the characteristics of the other pairs in this cohesive streetscene.
5. The proposed two storey side extension, which would replace the garage, would be set down slightly at ridge level and its front face would be slightly recessed compared to the host. However, it would have a tapered side wall which would angle away from the host to fill the plot width, and its rear face would be not much shorter than the original dwelling's two storey width.

6. Its side wall would abut the boundary next to a footpath which runs through an area of public open space. From there the wall would angle slightly inwards to form the side of the proposed 6 metre deep single storey rear extension.
7. As a result of their siting, height, and largely unarticulated depth, the proposed extensions' western side walls would have a very domineering impact when viewed from the adjacent footpath. Given its significant height and width, the two storey side extension would also have a significant bulk, which would not appear entirely subordinate to the host. Its tapered layout would give it a rather awkward form, and a discordant mass, including at roof level, which would be clearly apparent in the streetscene when approaching along Broadway from the west.
8. I have no details of the 'similar extension built in this area' referred to in the appellant's letter of 30 March 2023. However, given that 143 Broadway has a single storey garage to the side, the scheme would also unbalance this semi-detached pair. From my on-site observations the resultant building's form and bulk would be at odds with the fairly regular pattern, mass and scale of development in this part of the streetscene.
9. For these reasons, the scheme would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would thereby conflict with those parts of Policies 9 and 20 of the Oldham Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD (2011) which, in general terms, require high quality design, and proposals which respect local character and do not have a significant adverse impact on visual amenity.
10. I note that the application the subject of this appeal, followed a previously refused scheme, and that amendments were made to it following discussions with officers. However, I have dealt with the scheme before me on its planning merits.
11. In its favour, the scheme would provide the occupiers with additional space and thereby improve their living conditions. However, that private benefit does not outweigh the significant harm that I have found it would cause. The scheme would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole and, having regard to all other matters raised, including representations by interested parties, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

*Chris Couper*

INSPECTOR