



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2023

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/23/3330491

11 Carr House Road, Springhead, Oldham, Lancashire OL4 4NW

- 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 K Doherty against the decision of Oldham Council.
 - The application Ref HOU/351084/23, dated 20 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is an extension to front and rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal includes a front and rear extension. The council's concern relates only to the front extension. This would increase the size of the existing porch which provides stepped access to the ground and first floors beyond. The proposed larger area would continue to provide access to the stairs but would reposition the front door to the side and create a larger area, depicted as a hall/study, to the front of the house. Although the council are concerned about the plans, the first floor plan clearly illustrates the accommodation to be provided which would be on a single level.
 4. The houses in this row are of a uniform design with a cat-slide roof from the main roof down to the porch area. The ground floor is set at a lower level. The ground floor front windows are high level and obscure glazed. They therefore provide light rather than outlook. Given the orientation and the position of the dividing fence, the new structure would not alter the living conditions within the neighbouring house. The proposal would however significantly alter the appearance of the front of the dwelling and although it would be at a lower level than the road and screened to some extent by the front hedge, it would be clearly evident from the street.
 5. The proposed changes would introduce a small gable that would hip into the cat-slide roof. There would also be a flat roofed element adjacent to the shared boundary. I appreciate that the existing porch area offers limited functionality
-

due to its size and configuration. I also acknowledge that the attached property has been extended to the front, although this follows the existing form of the house. I consider that the arrangement of the forward gable and its relationship with the cat-slide roof, would detract from the appearance of the property. The new element would be a prominent and discordant design feature that would be at odds with the designs of these houses. It would not sit comfortably within the frontage of the property and would represent poor design in this context.

6. Given the above, the proposal would be at odds with the design requirements of policies 9(a.iv) and 20 of the Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2011. The front extension would also result in conflict with the design objectives of the *National Planning Policy Framework*.
7. The proposal would bring benefits with regard to investment and improved accommodation within this property. Whilst I note the lack of concerns expressed locally and the potential support from the attached neighbour, I conclude that the matters in favour of the front extension are not sufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR