



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/25/3366644

1 Alexander Avenue, Failsworth, Oldham M35 9JX

- 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 James Shaw against the decision of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application reference is HOU/354175/25.
 - The development proposed is a first floor front extension and new roof to side garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have taken the description of development from the Council's Decision Notice as this is a more accurate description of development and includes reference to the proposed roof to the garage.
4. I observed on my site visit that the development has commenced but was not complete. My recommendation is, however, based on the development as shown on the plans considered by the Council.
5. The Council has no concerns with the proposed new roof to the side garage. The Council's concerns are focussed on the proposed first-floor front extension. I have no reason to form a different view and have defined the main issue on that basis.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first-floor front extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The appeal property comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated in a residential area. The dwellings on Alexander Avenue have a consistent appearance overall. They mostly include a main two-storey bay window feature to the front elevation. While some of the dwellings have been extended, extensions generally appear subservient. The host dwelling also features a main two-storey bay window feature to the front elevation, designed with a gable roof above. The prominence

and consistency of the two-storey bay windows in the street scene adds to its visual coherence and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

8. Due to the noticeable outward projection and the siting of the extension at first floor level, when combined with its gable roof design, it would visually compete with the main two-storey bay window feature of the host dwelling. The extension would therefore appear conspicuous in the street scene and would undermine the prominence and rhythmic hierarchy of the main centrally positioned two-storey bay windows of the dwellings on Alexander Avenue. Consequently, the extension would be an incongruous addition to the host dwelling and would erode the visual consistency of the street scene.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would 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 (2024), which amongst other matters, requires that developments respect the character and identity of the locality including in terms of scale, siting and design.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations which would alter this finding. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR