

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2021

by R Walker BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/20/3261013

2 Braybrook Drive, Bolton BL1 5XA

- 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 Mrs Rehana Ditta against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 08297/20, dated 18 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is proposed two storey front, rear & side extension with front porch and rear balconies.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application which accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling located on a corner in a suburban residential area. The proposal would result in a significant increase in the size of the host dwelling. Other than the ground floor porch, it would create a large unbroken mass to all side walls at two-storeys.
5. The combination of its overall massing and design would result in a dominant, obtrusive built form. Moreover, the proposal would result in an inconsistency in design and positioning of windows throughout. Individually, elements are compatible with the surrounding area. However, collectively this would result in a somewhat ad-hoc design, exacerbating the harm from its scale and massing.
6. The front, side and to a lesser extent upper parts of its rear elevation, through gaps in planting, would form part of the street scene. In this prominent corner

- location, the resulting development would jar injuriously with the surrounding built form.
7. There are other large properties in the area. However, none that I have been referred to, or saw, share the same combination of scale and design with its mostly unbroken massing and prominent corner position.
 8. A large proportion of the plot would remain undeveloped, matching materials would be used and there would be a degree of balance to the front façade. However, despite these elements, the overall resulting development would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 9. The proposal would therefore conflict with the requirements of Policies CG3 and OA4 of the Council's Core Strategy (2011). These require, amongst other things, development to be compatible with the surrounding area, in terms of scale, massing, grain, form and architecture.
 10. The proposal would also conflict with the requirements of the Council's House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) insofar as it relates to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This SPD, amongst other things, stipulates that the siting, design or layout of a house extension should not have an unacceptable effect on the wider street scene or the character of the locality.
 11. Paragraphs 4.14, 4.15 and 4.23 of the SPD refer to, amongst other things, issues relating to terraced and town houses, natural light and overshadowing and are not, therefore, determinative in relation to the main issue. The proposal would not harm the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties and would comply with the SPD, insofar as it relates to living conditions. However, the absence of harm is a neutral matter that weighs neither for nor against the proposal.
 12. I understand that extending the property might meet the appellant's need for increased accommodation. However, personal circumstances will seldom outweigh more general planning concerns and the appellant's desire to extend the property does not outweigh my concerns relating to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 13. For all the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Robert Walker

INSPECTOR