
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2025

by **D Ellis MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/24/3354924

5 Penryn Avenue, Royton, Oldham OL2 6JR

- 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 Peter Deekin against the decision of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is HOU/353324/24.
 - The development is a single storey front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit the porch had been constructed. However, there is some discrepancy between the porch as built, which is finished in grey render, and the submitted documents which state that the render is to be off-white. Where an appeal is submitted, it is made against the decision of the Council to refuse permission for the specific development proposed at the application stage. It is not the purpose of the appeal process to amend or evolve a scheme but to consider whether the Council's decision to refuse a particular proposal was justified. Where the built elements of the proposal differ from what is shown on the submitted drawings that were before the Council when the original application was determined, I have determined these elements on the basis of the submitted drawings.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling with a two-storey side extension. The first floor of the original house is slightly set back from the ground floor, with a mono-pitch roof between the ground and first floor. The depth of the porch combined with the set-back of the first floor, particularly when viewed from the east, gives the porch an uncomfortably large and bulky appearance. This is exacerbated by the ridge height and the front gable design of the porch, which is also inconsistent with the design of the other properties in the street.
5. Some other properties nearby have porches, including 12 and 16 Cornish Way. However, these porches have hipped or mono-pitched roofs which lessen their

visual impact and, furthermore, these properties do not have the first floor set back from the ground floor. As such these other porches are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme and do not justify it.

6. Overall, the porch is an incongruous addition to the dwelling as a result of its bulk, scale and design and, consequently, it causes harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. The porch therefore conflicts with Policy JP-P1 of the Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024), insofar as it requires development to respect the character of the locality including in terms of design, size and scale.

Conclusion

7. The development conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

D Ellis

INSPECTOR