
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2017

by I Radcliffe BSc(Hons) MRTPI MCIEH DMS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/17/3168576
116 Rishton Lane, Bolton BL3 6QG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Ashrafia against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 97902/16, dated 15 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Rishton Lane is characterised by Victorian terraced properties on its southern side and late twentieth century terraced houses on its northern side. The appeal property is a house located within a residential Victorian terrace on the southern side of the Lane between Finney Street and the end of Rishton Lane. Shops enclose the terrace at either end. The terrace is characterised by the uniformity of houses which have flat fronts, modest porticos and low front boundary walls with railings separating public from private space. As a consequence, each house is well designed and the terrace has an attractive rhythm of development that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
 4. The proposed front extension would extend across the full width of the house and occupy all the space between its front elevation and the back edge of the pavement. As a result, it would dominate the ground floor of the property and disrupt the regular rhythm of development that characterises the terrace. In addition, its window would be far smaller than the existing ground floor window to the house and other houses in the terrace. The absence of a stone cill and header to the window and a formal surround to the front door would further accentuate its incongruity in relation to the host building and terrace. Consequently, the proposed front extension would have a significant adverse effect on the street scene.
 5. Reference has been made to other properties on the Lane that have front extensions, including a barber shop two doors away from the appeal property. However, these front extensions are not a feature of the houses in the terrace
-

of which the appeal property forms a part. Furthermore, they are too few and far between to have altered the character and appearance of the area to the extent that the proposed extension would fit in. The presence of enclosed front porches to the modern terraced houses facing the appeal site has also been referred to. However, unlike the proposed development, these features are modest in size and form part of the original design of these dwellings. Consequently reference to these matters has not altered my findings in relation to this issue.

6. For all of these reasons, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policy CG3 of Bolton's Core Strategy. This policy requires the protection of the character and appearance of a locality through high quality design that respects local design features. It would also be contrary to the supplementary planning document 'House Extensions' which, whilst supportive of rear extensions to increase the size of terraced housing, is not supportive of front extensions that harm the street scene.
7. The appellant and his wife have five children and the extension would increase the size of the lounge. Whilst I have given the appellant's personal circumstances careful consideration, I am mindful of the advice contained in Planning Practice Guidance¹ that in general planning is concerned with land use in the public interest. It is also probable that the proposed development would remain long after the current personal circumstances cease to be material. For these reasons, I therefore find that this factor is not sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the development plan.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Ian Radcliffe

Inspector

¹ Paragraph 008 Reference ID 21b-008-20140306 – 'What is a material planning consideration?'