
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2019

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/19/3232243

2 Cedar Grove, Farnworth, Bolton BL4 0BE

- 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 David Boardman against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 05639/19, dated 4 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2019.
 - The development is an attached bicycle and garden store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The development has already been undertaken and therefore I have determined this appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The dwelling is sited towards the head of a small cul-de sac and is set forward of the adjacent dwelling, 3 Cedar Grove. This positioning increases the prominence of the store within the street scene. Dwellings in this area are constructed from red brick with elements of render at first floor level and this creates a generally consistent character and appearance.
5. The store is constructed from timber and felt, materials which contrast with those used on the main dwelling. These materials, along with the general design of the store, give it a poor visual appearance and one which visually jars with the more substantial appearance of the dwelling, including the materials from which it is constructed. This has caused significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, particularly given its prominence in the street scene.
6. The appellant has made reference to similar developments in the area. Whilst I noted during my site visit that some other dwellings do have extensions to the side, I have no details about the circumstances of these and I saw no extensions that were of a comparable scale to that subject of this appeal. In any event, I have considered the development based upon its own merits.

7. The appellant has stated that they would be willing to comply with any condition imposed requiring the development to be clad in a different material. However, no specific suggestion as to what form the cladding could take has been made. In the absence of such information, I am not convinced that the cladding of the development could be undertaken in a manner that would satisfactorily overcome the significant harm that I have identified.
8. I conclude therefore that the development forms an incongruous feature and significantly harms the character and appearance of the area. This is contrary to the design aims of Policy CG3 of the Bolton Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 and the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2012, both of which seek to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

9. I understand the appellant's wish to prevent their possessions being left outside and being unsightly, but this does not justify a harmful development. I also note the appellant's representations regarding advice given about permitted development rights and about structures that could potentially be built using permitted development rights. I must however consider the development before me and these matters do not outweigh the significant harm to character and appearance that has arisen.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR