



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/25/3361873

30 Springwood Estate, Delph, Oldham OL3 5HQ

- 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. Ashley Phethean against the decision of the Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is HOU/352974/24.
 - The development proposed is part single storey/part two storey side extension with balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council changed the description of development from that referenced on the application form; in the interests of clarity, I have adopted the revised description of development. I note that the Appellant also uses this on the appeal form.
3. The appellant has submitted a revised plan detailing the removal of the balcony and a recessed garage door. These plans were not considered by the Council. The revisions represent a material change to the proposal. If I were to determine the appeal on the basis of the amended plans it is possible that the interests of parties who may wish to comment would be prejudiced. I have determined this proposal on the basis of the plans considered by the Council.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the development on (i) the character and appearance of the host property and area in general; (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers at No. 19 Springwood; and (iii) highway safety

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is an end terraced two storey property located on a corner plot in Springwood which is a predominantly residential area. There is architectural harmony to the form of properties in the area. The topography of the area steadily rises from the entrance into the Springwood up to the appeal site.
6. The proposed development would be a prominent addition to this elevated corner plot, adding considerable bulk to the existing modest property. Whilst matching

external materials are proposed to integrate the development with the existing property and surrounding area, given its scale and design the proposed development would be incongruous.

7. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and area in general. There is conflict with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document for Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan 2022-2039 (2024) (the Places for Everyone DPD) and Policy 9 of the Oldham Development Plan Document – Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2011) (the Joint DPD) which amongst other things seeks to ensure developments are high quality protecting the visual amenity of an area.

Living Conditions

8. No. 19 Springwood lies to the rear of the appeal site, properties in the area experience mutual overlooking. However, due to the elevated position of the appeal site compared to No. 19 the proposed balcony would be a dominant addition which would exacerbate overlooking and loss of privacy. I find that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 19 Springwood.
9. The proposed development would conflict with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone DPD and Policy 9 of the Joint DPD which seeks, amongst things to protect the living conditions of the occupants of residential properties by ensuring adequate privacy is retained.

Highway Safety

10. The appeal site is located on a corner Springwood, whilst existing parking occurs within the site the proposed development will replace this and provide a garage and one parking space to the front. The Council's Highway Consultation Response confirms that the proposed parking arrangement would not be possible without a vehicle overhanging the highway.
11. Due to the positioning of the built form and the topography of the site the proposed development would result in restricted visibility for vehicles. I observed during my site visit that reversing from a driveway in this residential estate would not be uncommon. Nevertheless, the appellant has not provided evidence to demonstrate that vehicles would be able to manoeuvre safely from the site onto the highway.
12. I conclude that the proposed development would harm highway safety. There is conflict with Policy 9 of the Joint DPD which amongst other things seeks to protect pedestrians and road users.
13. There is conflict with the Framework which seeks amongst other things for developments to have an acceptable impact on highway safety.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR