

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2024

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/24/3342570

11 Sheraton Road, Oldham OL8 1AZ

- 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 S Mahmood against the decision of Oldham Council.
 - The application Ref HOU/352063/23, dated 5 December 2023, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is a front dormer.
-

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 existing dwelling forms part of a terrace of similar houses which have a simple roof form with a side facing gable to each end of the terrace. This terrace of houses and a number of other similar terraces, face three sides of a large open green space. Apart from the neighbouring property, there are no other front facing dormers that face this open space. The character of this particular area is defined by the simple and consistent form of the frontages of these two storey houses and their relationship with the green space. The introduction of a front facing dormer, of this scale and form, would detract from the existing character and appearance of this property and the area. It would represent poor design in this context.
 4. Whilst the neighbouring property has a similar forward facing structure, it is unclear when this was built. There does not appear to be any planning history relating to it. It is not a positive feature in the street scene and allowing additional structures of this kind would further erode the existing character and appearance of the area. It is evident that there are other local streets that have had front dormers built. No evidence has been provided to suggest that these have had planning permission but, in any event, this proposal must be considered on its own merits and in light of the current, almost entirely uniform, appearance of the front roofs of the residential properties that face the open space. Similarly, whilst rear dormers are relatively common, including
-

at the appeal property, the impact of these on the wider area differs significantly from development to front facing roof slopes.

5. The proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with the design objectives of policies 9(a.iv) and 20(a) of the Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2011. The *National Planning Policy Framework* 2023 is clear that development that is not well designed should be refused.
6. Reference has been made to the New Chadderton Partnership. I have been provided with no information regarding this but understand that it is an approved organisation tasked with bringing forward a Chadderton Neighbourhood Plan and that the references made by the appellant are to its constitution. The appellant advises that one of its principles is to promote and improve social, economic and environmental wellbeing. It is suggested that this proposal would improve the life and welfare of the occupants as the current space available within the property is too constrained for their needs. Although there is no neighbourhood plan at present, I afford considerable weight to the social benefits of the proposal as these accord with the objectives of the *Framework*.
7. I have had regard to the personal circumstances of the occupants and the reported need for increased space, together with the economic benefits that would come from such an investment and improvement programme. However, the benefits are not sufficient to outweigh my concerns with regard to the design and appearance of the proposal and the adverse impact it would have on local character. In conclusion, the matters in favour of the proposal do not outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR