



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2025

by **K Mansell BA (Hons) MPhil TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/25/3368106

26 Grains Road, Delph, Oldham OL3 5DS

- 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 Ms Rothwell against the decision of Oldham Council.
 - The application Ref is HOU/354120/25.
 - The development proposed is new dormer to the rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and on the Delph Conservation Area (DCA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property at No 26 is a semi-detached dwelling occupying a reasonably elevated position along Grains Road, with extended open views to the rear. From the street, it is two storeys. However, at the back of the house, the ground falls steeply away towards Holland Close, resulting in a three-storey rear elevation. No 26 is constructed in a mixture of stone and brick with a slate roof, materials that are prevalent along the street. On my site visit, I observed a similar roof pitch on the appeal property to adjoining and nearby dwellings, and a general absence of dormer windows along the street. This stretch of Grains Road consequently has a reasonably traditional and uniform character.
4. No 26 lies within the DCA where Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. From my observations on site, it is the traditional architectural vernacular, including typically unaltered roof profiles, the use of stone and slate, a sense of enclosure created by buildings positioned on or close to the pavement edge, and the village's topography, which allows for long-ranging views to and from the surrounding rural landscape, that contribute positively to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole. It is these attributes that give the CA its special interest and significance.
5. The appeal scheme would introduce a dormer window extending across almost the entire width and height of the rear roof plane. Coupled with its flat roof design, it would result in a large box like structure that would add significant bulk and massing to the house. Even if its contemporary design would reflect the modern

fenestration treatment to the rear elevation, it would fail to respect the dwelling's original proportions. It would consequently represent a visually obtrusive addition to the host property. The choice of materials would not sufficiently mitigate this impact, as it would still represent a dominant roof extension irrespective of the materials used. My assessment must also be confined to the appeal scheme before me. It does not extend to considering alternative methods for achieving additional accommodation. Furthermore, the absence of any noted impact by the Council on neighbouring living conditions does not overcome the harm that I have identified.

6. The dormer would also significantly alter the rear roof profile to No 26. Whilst views of it along Grains Road would be partially screened by existing vegetation, it would become more visible in winter when these trees are not in leaf. Furthermore, on my site visit, I saw that due to its elevated position, the appeal scheme would be visible from Holland Close within the DCA. From this lower viewpoint, despite the presence of 1970s flats and the modern Medical Centre, it would remain clearly perceptible from public vantage points along the road. The proportions of the rear dormer when viewed from this perspective would be prominent, and it would disrupt the inherent symmetry of the roof form with the adjoining semi. In the absence of any other visible dormer windows, it would also introduce an incongruous and uncharacteristic feature at odds with the form of the host dwelling and the wider setting. It would consequently fail to make a positive contribution to the DCA.
7. For these reasons, I consider that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the DCA. Given its modest scale as a residential extension, in the terms of the Framework, I am satisfied that the harm to the significance of the DCA as a whole would be less than substantial. Having regard to Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), such harm should then be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
8. I recognise that the development would provide additional living space within the roof, which would meet the needs of the appellant's growing family. However, this would represent a private benefit. Even if it would create a 3-bedroom family home rather than a 2-bedroom house, given that the proposal is for an extension to a single existing dwelling, any public benefits in this respect to a mix of house types in the area would be slight. I am also not persuaded from the evidence before me that the continued viable use of the appeal property as a residential dwelling would be dependent upon the appeal proposal. The building would have an on-going residential use that would not cease in the absence of the appeal scheme. Such limited benefits would consequently not outweigh the less than substantial harm to the significance of the DCA that I have identified.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and also, on the DCA, which, it follows, would not be preserved or enhanced. Accordingly, it would be contrary to Policy 24 of the Oldham Local Development Framework Development Plan Document – Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2011) and Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024). These policies require, amongst other matters, that new development, including extensions, must respect the context, be sensitively designed and preserve or enhance the character of Conservation Areas. It would

further conflict with the Framework, which generally promotes the importance of good design and the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.

Conclusion

10. The appeal proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations that would indicate a decision otherwise would be appropriate. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Mansell

INSPECTOR