



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2025

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/24/3351689

11 Eustace Street, Chadderton, Oldham OL9 0DZ

- 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 Abdul Aziz against the decision of Oldham Council.
 - The application Ref is HOU/352851/24.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'rear and side extension (single storey)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear and side extensions at 11 Eustace Street, Chadderton, Oldham OL9 0DZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HOU/352851/24, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: site location plan; existing site plan and ground floor plan; existing front, rear and side elevations; proposed ground floor plan; proposed roof plan; and proposed front, rear and side elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The host comprises an end of terrace house, which sits on a particularly wide plot in a fairly prominent position on the corner of Eustace Street and Rosewood Crescent. It has been previously extended with two storey projections to the side and rear. The local area is residential, comprising a diverse mix of two storey terraces and semi-detached pairs, along with bungalows.
4. The flank wall of the proposed single storey side extension would attach to the existing two storey side projection and would abut the boundary with the pavement.

However, the host has an extant planning permission for a side extension in that location, which I understand is identical to the side extension before me¹.

5. As well as that side extension, this scheme also includes a rear extension which would attach to, and project 3.4 metres beyond, the host's two storey rear projection. However, both of the proposed extensions would be single storey, and they would have shallow pitched roofs which would assist in limiting their bulk. They would also be faced in matching materials, and they would have matching fenestration, which would help to assimilate them with the host.
6. Moreover, as the plot is contained by roughly 2 metre high masonry walls to the sides and rear, in most streetscene views from Rosewood Crescent and Eustace Street only the uppermost sections of the proposed extensions would be visible above them. From Rosewood Crescent the rear extension would also be seen together with the similar single storey rear extensions with shallow pitched roofs at 5 and 7 Eustace Street, and which project a broadly similar distance to the rear.
7. Whilst the appellant states that he would be willing to 'relinquish' an approved outbuilding in the rear garden, I have not been provided with an appropriate mechanism whereby that could be achieved. I have therefore considered this proposal irrespective of that suggestion.
8. Having regard to cumulative impacts, I did not observe any nearby examples where the original property has been so significantly extended as would be the case here. However, this is a particularly large plot, such that, even when viewed from within it, the resultant development would not appear overly cramped. Given the local context, this plot's size, boundary treatment, and the extensions' form and design, the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area.
9. It would not therefore conflict with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document 2022 to 2039 (2024). Amongst other things, this sets out that development should respect and acknowledge the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials.
10. Turning to the matter of conditions, as well as the standard time limit, in the interests of certainty, a condition is necessary requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Finally, in the interests of good design, I have imposed a condition requiring that the scheme be faced in materials to match the host.
11. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR

¹ Ref: HOU/349577/22