
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2020 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/20/3253776

69 The Sheddings, Bolton BL3 2JN

- 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 A Altaf against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 07809/20, dated 10 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension with single storey rear extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - (i) The effect of the proposed development on character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area; and
 - (ii) Whether the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for the occupiers of No 69 The Sheddings, with particular regard to garden provision.

Reasons

4. This appeal concerns a two-storey semi-detached dwelling occupying a prominent corner plot on The Sheddings. It is of similar character and appearance to the surrounding properties in the locality. Permission is sought for a two-storey side extension, with a single storey rear extension and porch to the front.

Character and appearance

5. The surrounding locality is predominantly characterised by pairs of properties which occupy staggered positions compared to neighbouring properties.

Indeed, the host dwelling itself is positioned forward of the building line to the north west and south east along The Sheddings therefore I do not consider the immediate building line to be consistent. Nevertheless, there is currently good spacing to the side of the appeal dwelling which gives a sense of openness and contributes positively to the wider street scene. Therefore, due to the proposal's overall width and bulk, it would erode the space at this prominent corner plot and would read as an overly dominant addition to the street scene.

6. Paragraph 3.1 of the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document, Bolton Council (August 2012) (the SPD) notes a well designed extension should be subordinate in relation to the dwelling and should be of a size and scale which is in proportion to the existing house. It notes that overly large side extensions can completely ruin the character of the property or unbalance a symmetrical pair of semi-detached dwellings. The proposed two-storey side extension would have a significant width, projecting up to the side boundary of the appeal site and it would have a height to match the host dwelling. It would introduce substantial massing to the side which would read as an overly dominant addition to the host property.
7. Due to its prominent location, this addition would be readily apparent in the street scene and would create a significant visual unbalance with the attached dwelling at No 67 The Sheddings, thus disrupting the distinct symmetry between the pair of semi-detached properties. It is acknowledged that the proposal seeks to create a balanced façade in terms of the appeal dwelling. However, this would be to the detriment of the readily apparent visual symmetry of this pair of semi-detached properties and the wider street scene.
8. My attention has been drawn to examples of other extensions in the area and I observed these at the time of my visit. No 38 The Sheddings has a staggered front elevation and an integral garage which sit forward of the attached dwelling. As such, this pair of semi-detached dwellings is not symmetrical, unlike the appeal dwelling and its attached property. It is acknowledged that the side extension at No 28 The Sheddings lacks a set down ridge line and set back front elevation. However, this property does not occupy a prominent corner plot and thus is not as readily apparent in the street scene as the appeal dwelling. As such, I do not consider these examples to be directly comparable to the proposal before me and they do not therefore justify this appeal.
9. Consequently, taking all the above into consideration, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy CG3 of Bolton's Core Strategy (March 2011) (the CS) which seeks, amongst other things, to conserve and enhance local distinctiveness ensuring development has regard to the overall built character of the area and developments are compatible with the surrounding area in terms of scale and massing. It would also fail to accord with the guidance of the SPD as noted above.

Living conditions

10. The proposed development would result in the loss of some private garden space to the side and rear of the dwelling due to its significant scale and massing and the inclusion of two off-street parking spaces to the rear. The extended dwelling would have five bedrooms and could accommodate a large family. The resultant private garden space would fall significantly below the 50

square metres as recommended in the SPD and would be of a limited depth and width. As such it would provide inadequate outdoor amenity space for a property of the size proposed.

11. The appellant suggests there are properties in the locality which have less external space however I have not been provided with any further details. Nevertheless, I observed that most properties in the immediate area along The Sheddings are semi-detached or detached and have good sized gardens.
12. The appellant has suggested that a parking space could be relocated to the front, thus increasing the garden space to the rear. However, I can only determine the appeal on the basis of the plans which have been considered by the Council.
13. As such, this proposal would not provide satisfactory living conditions for the occupiers of the extended dwelling and would therefore conflict with the requirements of the SPD as noted above and the National Planning Policy Framework which requires that developments create places which promote health and well-being with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

14. I have had regard to the medical information which the appellant has submitted in support of this appeal. However, there is little evidence before me to demonstrate why an extension of the proposed scale and massing is needed to provide the required levels of care and accommodation. This limits the weight I can give the matter in support of the proposal. Thus this private benefit of the proposal does not therefore outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hannah Ellison

Appeal Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR