
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2021 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/21/3279377

5 Crofters Walk, Bradshaw, Bolton BL2 4NX

- 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 Graham Sanders against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 10803/21, dated 16 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension.
-

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 Issue

3. Whilst the appeal site lies within the Green Belt, the Council have not indicated that the proposal is inappropriate development and have limited the reasons for refusal to the harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider area. From the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree and have therefore limited my consideration of the appeal to this matter.
4. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is located within an area which has a mix of traditional dwelling types with an informal arrangement around cul de sacs and private drives, giving an open and spacious character. There are consistent design features within the locality, including relatively flat frontages, central circular windows and stone arch details around the doors which contributes to the regular rhythm of the area.
6. The introduction of a mono-pitched front extension would result in an alien addition in the streetscene which would be prominent and significantly harmful to the otherwise simple design of the host dwelling. Moreover, the door and window design and the use of roof lights would not reflect the design of the host dwelling or nearby neighbours. As a consequence, the contribution that the extended dwelling would make to the character and appearance of the

locality would be significantly reduced, and harm would be caused to the local distinctiveness of the area.

7. I note that the proposal would increase the size of living accommodation for the appellant, however it is likely that there would be other options available to secure similar accommodation and that the proposal is not the only option available. This matter does not therefore weigh in favour of the proposal. The lack of concern expressed by neighbours is a neutral factor which neither weighs for or against the proposal. The use of matching materials would not provide mitigation for the harm identified.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area in conflict with Policies CG3 and OA5.8 of Bolton's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) which together, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development conserves local distinctiveness and has regard to the built character of the area. It would also conflict with the guidance in the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2012) which states that extensions should respect particular features of the house including stone detailing, incorporate architectural features present in the existing house and should not unduly impact on the existing street scene.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR