
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2020

by M Shrigley BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/20/3248734

7 Oak Coppice, Bolton BL1 5JD

- 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 Matthew Brown against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 07325/19, dated 13 November, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is a "lot conversion with rear dormer".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description quoted in the above banner is that given on the planning application form. The submitted appeal form description reads as "loft conversion with rear dormer" and better describes the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and locality.

Reasons

4. The host property is a detached dwelling within the Chorley New Road Conservation Area (CA) which is recognised for containing large and distinctive residential properties within a wooded setting. The dwelling is set within a small gated cul-de-sac of similar sized properties featuring gable roofs. Tall trees and mature hedgerow run around the periphery of the cul-de-sac secluding it from roadside views. Immediately to the rear of the dwelling there is a large sports pitch adjoining the boundary.
5. I note the host dwelling features a distinctive uncluttered main roof design, as do neighbouring dwellings either side. The proposed dormer would span around 9.5m of the total rear roof slope with an overall height marginally below the dwellings main roof ridge. Considering the overall mass of the dormer would fill most of the existing roof plane it would not constitute a subordinate addition.
6. Owing to the height, depth and width of the dormer it would result in an overly dominant and incongruous addition to the host dwelling that fails to respect its prevailing character, or that of the dwellings either side. Although the dormer would be situated in a rear facing position it would still be highly visible from

neighbouring domestic curtilages, as well as the sports pitch. Subsequently, dormer would be viewed as a dominant and incongruous addition within that context. I appreciate that matching external facing materials could be utilised with the aim of assimilating the dormers appearance, however this would not overcome my fundamental concerns regarding its visual impact. Due to the visual harm to the host property, the development would not preserve or enhance the character of the CA.

7. The dormer would impact on a localised part of the CA when considered as a whole. Thus, I consider the harm would be less than substantial within the meaning of Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In accordance with the Framework this subsequently leads me to weigh up the public benefits of the proposal. However, there are none which have been raised or which attract significant weight to outweigh the harm identified. This results in demonstrable conflict with Paragraph 193 of the Framework because harm to the CA does not have a clear and convincing justification and the Framework requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality. It would be contrary to the spirit of the advice contained within the House Extensions SPD 2012 which encourages appropriately designed dormers and conflicts with Policy CG3 of Bolton's Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 which requires that development conserves and enhances local distinctiveness inclusive of specific regard to heritage assets. The proposal is also in conflict with Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Areas) Act 1990, and the provisions of the Framework relating to the enhancement and protection of designated heritage assets from harm.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I dismiss the appeal.

M Shrigley

INSPECTOR