



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2024

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/24/3353666

18 Primrose Avenue, Uppermill, Oldham, OL3 6DZ

- 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 N Corrigan against the decision of Oldham Council.
 - The application Ref is HOU/352933/24.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension at 18 Primrose Avenue, Uppermill, Oldham, OL3 6DZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HOU/352933/24 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the original building.

Procedural Matter

2. Neighbours have submitted representations which include objections to the proposed development in respect of its effect on residential amenity. However, the Council considers that there would be no significant harm in this regard.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling with a front and rear dormer. It has a ground floor rear extension and is located in a residential area characterised by the presence of detached and semi-detached bungalows and bungalows with dormers, amongst other types of dwellings.
5. The appeal dwelling is set back from the road behind a low wall and front garden and has a driveway to the side and a garden to the rear.
6. During my site visit I noted that dwellings in the area are set back behind gardens and that driveways provide for gaps between dwellings and the side of dwellings. This makes for a green and spacious character.

7. Also during my site visit, I observed that many dwellings have been extended and/or altered, with plentiful evidence of changes to dwellings at both ground floor and roof level.
8. The proposed development would comprise a small first floor extension to the rear of the appeal dwelling. Due to its size and its location to the rear of the dwelling, the proposal would not appear prominently within the wider area.
9. Further to the above, the proposed use of materials would result in the presence of uniform finishes to the front, rear and side of the dwelling. As a consequence, the proposed rear extension would appear in keeping with the host dwelling. The materials proposed would fit in with the dwelling's modernised appearance and would not appear out of character with other modernised dwellings in the surrounding area.
10. Taking all of the above into account, I consider that the proposed development would comprise a modest and carefully conceived addition to the host dwelling. Whilst the Council suggests that the proposal would be utilitarian, I am satisfied that, taking the above into account, its appearance would be neither unattractive nor harmful to the host dwelling or its surroundings and there is no substantive evidence before me to the contrary.
11. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would not be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to the Oldham Local Development Framework Development Plan Document – Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2011) Policy 9; or to the Places for Everyone Plan (2024) Policy JP-P1, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests set out in Paragraph 55 of the Framework. A condition controlling materials is necessary in the interest of local character.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is successful.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR