



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2019

by R Cooper BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/19/3226715

14 Carlton Close, Blackrod, Bolton BL6 5DL

- 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 P Jenkins against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 05262/19, dated 8 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is to raise the ridge and form a side dormer extension, and a single storey sun room to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed raised ridge and side dormer extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey sun room to the rear at 14 Carlton Close, Blackrod, Bolton BL6 5DL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 05262/19, dated 8 January 2019, and the plans submitted with it so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: Drawing No 1 (Existing and Proposed Floor Plans); and Drawing No 2 (Location Plan, Existing and Proposed Site Plan, Existing and Proposed Elevations)
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. For the reasons set out below, I find the proposed single storey sun room to the rear acceptable. Due to it being physically separate from the proposed works to the roof and dormer extension and can be built independently, I intend to issue a split decision in this case and grant planning permission for the sun room.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property 14 Carlton Close is located within an established residential area. The prevailing character of the street consists of a mix of detached bungalows, two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings. No 14 sits within a run of several bungalows on the northern side of Carlton Close, all sharing a distinctive appearance of symmetrical gabled frontages, except for No 12 next door which has a significantly altered appearance, which I address below. Due to the topography of the area they are elevated above the highway with undercroft garages, providing a distinctive appearance to the street.
5. The alteration of the roof would include extending the east facing roof slope, increasing the overall height and resulting in asymmetrical gables to the front and rear elevations. The side dormer would be set in from the front and rear elevations, and slightly set in off the side elevation. I acknowledge that a similar dormer at No 12 was granted planning permission by the Council (Ref 90993/13), and a similar permission granted for the appeal property in 2014 (Ref 92817/14), but not implemented. However, I consider that the mass of the dormer would encompass most of the west facing roof slope, dominating the appearance of the roof. This overbearing appearance would be exacerbated further by the proposed pitched roof of the dormer which would be significantly higher than that of the main roof.
6. By virtue of its proposed size and design, my assessment is that the side dormer extension would appear unacceptably dominant, and unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Furthermore, I find that the combination of a higher asymmetrical roof and the dormer would be significantly prominent within the street, appearing as an incongruous feature not in keeping the street scene, and harming the character and appearance of the area.
7. As such, the side dormer extension would fail to accord with the standards of design required by policies CG3 and OA1 of Bolton's Core Strategy. The proposal also conflicts with the Council's House Extensions SPD 2012, which seeks to restrict the size of dormer extensions to prevent them appearing dominant and harming the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene. The guidance therefore offers no support for the proposal.
8. During my site visit I was able to observe the existing dormer at No 12 Carlton Close, referred to by appellant. This is the only existing dormer in the street of this type of design and appearance, I noted its dominant appearance on the roof, and its prominence in the street scene. Being able to view the similar extension at No 12 does not alter my conclusion that the proposed development would be harmful the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.
9. The proposed rear extension would appear subordinate to the host dwelling and unobtrusive within the context of the site. Its location to the rear would mean it would not affect the appearance of the property from the front or effect the street scene, consequently the character and appearance of the area would not be harmed by the rear extension. I also note no objections have been received in relation to the rear extension and it does not form part of the Councils reason form refusal. I therefore find no harm with the proposed rear extension, and its design complies with policies CG3 and OA1 of Bolton's Core Strategy.

Other Matters

10. I have taken account of the representations received in relation to the proposed velux windows and the privacy of occupiers at No 12 Carlton Close. I understand from the submitted plans that these windows would be high level, irrespective of this, it does not affect my findings on the main issue.

Conditions

11. The Council have suggested planning conditions in the event of this appeal being allowed. I have also considered the use of planning conditions following the guidance set out in the Planning Practice Guidance. Insofar as they relate to the single storey sun room, in addition to the standard time limit condition, I have included a condition that specifies approved drawings to provide certainty, and materials to match the existing building in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey sun room to rear and dismissed insofar as it relates to the raised ridge and side dormer extension.

R Cooper

Inspector