



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2024

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/24/3349145

1 Woodend Street, Oldham OL1 2BZ

- 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 Mrs Mahfuja Khatun against the decision of Oldham Council.
 - The application Ref is HOU/352737/24.
 - The development proposed is 1. Rear Dormer 2. Erection of a front porch 3. Installation of new window to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice as it provided a more succinct, accurate description of the development before me than the one provided in the planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed increase in ridge height and rear dormer extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider terraced row.

Reasons

4. No.1 Woodend Street (No.1) is a two-storey, end of terrace dwelling which fronts Crompton Street on its northern side. No.1 has a simple pitched roof form and it is proposed to raise the ridge of the roof to accommodate a rear dormer extension and three bedrooms and a shower-room at second floor.
5. Crompton Street steeply slopes west to east, such that the roofline of No.1 and its wider terraced row is tiered or staggered. I observed on my site visit that whilst the tiered roofline is a characteristic of the terraced row, the increase in the height of the ridgeline is not entirely uniform. Notwithstanding this, the proposed height of around 1.1m would result in the ridge of No.1 sitting noticeably well above its attached neighbour at No.3 Woodend Street. The resulting change in roof pitch and profile would also appear markedly different from the rest of the terrace. In combination, this would result in an incongruous and unduly prominent addition, which would detract from the

character and appearance of the host dwelling, and its wider terrace, particularly when viewed from the west on Crompton Street.

6. The proposed rear dormer would have a flat roof which would align with the ridgeline of the pitched roof (as increased) and would extend almost its full width, set in only minimally from the sides of the roof plane. Further, it would be offset only around 0.4m from the eaves of the new roof. Although the proposed rear dormer would be constructed in matching materials, because of its scale, it would all but consume the rear roof slope and would appear an unsympathetic and injurious addition, detracting from the simple, tiered rear elevation of the terrace which is particularly visible from Craven Street.
7. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposed increase in ridge height and rear dormer extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider terraced row. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy 9 of the Oldham Development Plan Document – Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2011) and Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024) which together require that development does not have a significant, adverse impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding area, including local townscape, respecting and acknowledging the character of the locality in terms of design, siting, size and scale. Finally, it would conflict with the principles of good design set out in Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

8. I have had careful regard to the needs of the appellant to add additional bedrooms to accommodate a growing family, and I recognise that the proposals would result in enhanced living accommodation. However, whilst a clear benefit of the proposal, this does not outweigh the significant harm I identify above to the character and appearance of No.1 and the wider terrace. I also note that the occupiers of two neighbouring dwellings intend to similarly extend their dwellings in the future, but in the absence of any further details, I afford this little weight in my consideration of the proposal before me.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR