

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2024

by A Berry MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/24/3346573

137 Denbydale Way, Royton, Oldham OL2 5TE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Adam Wood against the decision of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is HOU/352156/23.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of an existing porch with the erection of a new front extension, with accommodation in the roof space, erection of a part single part two storey rear extension, erection of a single storey outbuilding, masonry garden wall and raised planter.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the replacement of an existing porch with the erection of a new front extension, with accommodation in the roof space, erection of a part single part two storey rear extension, erection of a single storey outbuilding, masonry garden wall and raised planter at 137 Denbydale Way, Royton, Oldham OL2 5TE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HOU/352156/23, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. Prior to the determination of the planning application, the Council accepted revised drawings that changed the front extension from two-storeys to a single storey. The Council determined the planning application based on the revised drawings therefore, I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. The Council amended the description of development in their decision notice to reflect the amendment to the front extension. This description more accurately describes the development as proposed and therefore I have used it in the banner heading and 'Decision' section above.

Main Issue

4. The Council does not raise concern with the proposed rear extensions, accommodation in the roof space of the dwelling, an outbuilding, garden wall or planter. Consequently, the main issue is the effect of the proposed front extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling previously extended with a two-storey side/rear extension and a front porch. It is set back from the road by a front garden used for off-road parking. The appeal site forms part of a housing development that predominantly consists of two house types in the immediate vicinity. However, the uniformity of the dwellings has been eroded with various extensions and alterations.
6. The existing front porch would be replaced with a porch of a greater width (extending across part of the existing two-storey side extension) and a greater depth. However, its eaves and overall height would be similar. Although larger, it would still be subservient to the host dwelling and would not dominate the dwelling's façade. The replacement porch would be visible when travelling along the road. However, its distance from the road and its scale would ensure that it would not appear unduly dominant.
7. Porches and single storey front extensions of a variety of designs, materials and scales are a feature of the surrounding area. I acknowledge that the appeal proposal would be larger than some of the examples I saw during my site visit, however, it would also be comparable in scale or smaller than others. Consequently, it would not appear incongruous in the surrounding area, and it would respect and conserve the locality's character and identity.
8. In reference to the main issue, the proposed front extension would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would comply with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Plan Joint Development Plan Document for Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan 2022-2039 adopted 2024 which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure all development respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used. It would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework that seeks to achieve well designed and beautiful places.

Conditions

9. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council and the tests for conditions set out within the Framework. In addition to the standard condition, which relates to the commencement of development, I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have also included a condition requiring the development to be constructed of materials to match those used on the existing dwelling to ensure their external appearance is acceptable.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, having regard to the development plan as a whole, and all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Berry

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: P03B – Proposed Floor and Roof Plans, P04B Proposed Elevations and Location Plan (1:1250).

*****End of Conditions*****