

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2025

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/25/3364458

1 Marfield Avenue, Chadderton, Oldham, OL9 8PN

- 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 Ali against the decision of Oldham Council.
 - The application Ref is HOU/353914/24.
 - The development proposed is a porch to front entrance.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the development proposed is taken from the application form. Both the Council and the appellant refer to the application as being retrospective and the full description on the Council's decision notice is "Erection of porch to front entrance (retrospective)." In the interests of distinguishing this appeal from that referred to in the following paragraph, I refer to 'the proposed development' in the reasons set out below.
3. In addition to the application the subject of this appeal, the appellant submitted a retrospective application for "2No gable roofs in lieu of hipped. Ground floor and first floor extensions."¹ This application was refused by the Council and is the subject of a separate appeal decision².
4. The appeal property has planning permission for a two storey side/rear extension and single storey rear extension³. Development has taken place, but not in accordance with the permission.

Main Issue

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

¹ Reference: HOU/353554/24.

² Reference: APP/W4223/D/24/3362903.

³ Reference: HOU/351328/23.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is located in a residential area and comprises a two storey, brick and tile-built end of terrace dwelling within a short row of four dwellings. The appeal property is situated in a residential area, with two other similar short rows of four dwellings nearby on Marfield Avenue.
7. The appeal property is located close to Denton Lane, which is characterised by the presence of older brick and slate-built two storey terraced dwellings.
8. Unlike dwellings along Denton Lane, which are set close to the road behind low walls and narrow front garden areas, the three rows of four dwellings along Marfield Avenue are set back from the road behind parking areas and/or gardens. This affords Marfield Road a sense of spaciousness as one enters it from Denton Lane.
9. Further to the above, during my site visit, I observed that the three rows of four dwellings appear very similar in form. With the exception of the appeal dwelling, each of the end dwellings in each row has a hipped roof and within each terrace of four, pairs of dwellings to either side of a central passageway at ground floor level have bay windows to the ground floor with mono-pitch roofs between the bays and first floors.
10. These similarities, together with the common use of red brick and tile materials, result in an attractive sense of uniformity. Whilst I noted during my site visit that dwellings in the vicinity have been extended and/or altered, such changes do not generally detract from the spacious and uniform attributes of the area.
11. The proposed development would comprise a projecting porch with a pitched gable roof. The height, projection and prominent location of the front porch would result in it drawing attention to itself as an incongruous feature, where no other such porches exist. I find that this would detract significantly from the area's uniform qualities.
12. Further to the above, the harm arising would be exacerbated as a result of the porch appearing awkward due to a combination of its prominence and it appearing unbalanced relative to the host dwelling's fenestration, thus drawing further attention to its incongruous appearance.
13. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the development harms the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and to Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Plan (2024), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR