
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2022

by M Clowes BA (hons) MCD PGCERT (Arch con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/21/3282912

364 Tempest Road, Lostock, Bolton BL6 4HS

- 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 Ms Christine Wilkinson against the decision of Bolton Council.
 - The application Ref 11166/21, dated 1 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'cladding to side/back elevation of building; alteration to back bedroom floor space; rear porch.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant suggests that the extension is the same as that approved under a previous application Ref 01659/17. Having compared the existing and proposed plans for both applications, it is clear that there are differences between the first floor extension in this appeal in terms of its extent, eaves height and position in comparison to the previous approval.
3. At the time of my site visit, a number of alterations and extensions the subject of this appeal had been carried out at the appeal property at 364 Tempest Road. Whilst the development appears to accord with the submitted plans in terms of its overall size and position, there are deviations regarding the extent of the external cladding and window and rooflight numbers and positions. Furthermore, the north-eastern elevation is absent from the plans determined by the Council.
4. Having had regard to the overall scale and position of the proposed extension, I am satisfied that there is sufficient detail on the floorplans and supplied elevations to properly assess the impact of the extension on the character and appearance of the area. In reaching my decision, I have assessed the development as shown on the submitted plans and not as built on site.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site consists of a brick built semi-detached bungalow located in a residential area known as Chew Moor. It has a small frontage laid with gravel to form an off-road car parking area. Surrounding development consists of

other dwellings of varying sizes, styles and ages. To the south-east are semi-detached 2 storey dwellings with hipped roofs and primarily rendered front elevations. To the east is a cul-de-sac of large, modern, detached 2 storey properties, built of red brick with buff brick detailing and concrete tiles in both hipped and gabled roof forms. To the north is the attached semi-detached property and beyond are older 2 storey properties, with rendered and brick facades in a more organic layout.

7. I have been referred to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on House Extensions (2012). Amongst other things, it aims to ensure extensions are well designed and subordinate in size and scale to the host property. It states that flat roofed, 2 storey side extensions are not visually acceptable and that the style of roof should match the existing property.
8. The plans show the reconfiguration of the dwelling through the demolition and rebuilding of the original side wall in a set back position. The first floor would be extended with 2 projections of differing depths from the rear roof of the host property. The first floor extension would have an almost flat roof that would be almost level with the ridge of the original pitched roof.
9. The first floor extension would be clearly visible along Tempest Road, particularly when travelling in a north-easterly direction. This is due to the gap formed by the new access between the appeal site and its neighbour at No 366. The modest space between the street and the front of the property would also make it more visible.
10. The length, height and solid nature of the new first floor extension particularly the side elevation, along with the prominent box profile eaves to the flat roof, would result in an incongruous extension that would overwhelm the original modestly proportioned bungalow. As a result of it being deeper than the front pitch roof of No 364, the first floor extension would also fail to be subordinate to the original dwelling. I also find the size and appearance of the first floor extension would be significantly different to the side dormer window, which is shown on the original plans to be of a considerably smaller scale and subordinate size to the original dwelling. I therefore consider that the extension would conflict with the House Extensions SPD.
11. The appellant suggests that there is precedent for flat roofed extensions to the rear of properties. However, there are no other flat roofed buildings or extensions visible in public views within this part of Tempest Road. Roofscapes for surrounding properties are instead of a pitched gable or hipped form. Even though the prevailing character of the area is mixed, this does not justify new development that does not respect the host property or fails to take account of its surroundings.
12. Turning to materials, the upper section of the first floor extension has been finished in white UPVC cladding which stops abruptly at the apex of the roof. This light coloured and shiny material contrasts starkly with the rich, matt red brick of the property. Furthermore, its unusual use in a thin band at the top of the elevation, draws attention to the scale and dominant appearance of the extension.
13. During my visit I saw 3 properties with similar materials on Tempest Road and Pocket Nook Road. White cladding has also been used on the 2 new dwellings under construction to the rear of the appeal site. However, all of these

properties differ in their architectural style with cladding being used in a different form to the appeal property. I have no evidence as to the circumstances of these sites in terms of whether planning permission was required or has been granted for the use of cladding. Nevertheless, each case must be considered on its own merits. As described above, the prevailing palette of materials for surrounding development is red brick and render. Whilst the cladding could be changed to an alternative colour or material, this would not overcome the harm I have identified in respect of the scale and form of the extension.

14. The plans also include the provision of a single storey lean-to rear extension. Due to its small size and single storey nature, it would be subordinate in scale to the host building. It would be finished in render rather than brick to match the dwelling. However, as render is used locally, this material choice would not be inappropriate. The lean-to extension would not be harmful to the appearance of the host property or the wider area.
15. I conclude that the first floor extension would have a significantly harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its immediate surroundings. Therefore, the development proposed conflicts with Policies CG3.2, CG3.3 and OA3.7 of the Bolton Council Local Development Framework: Bolton's Core Strategy, Development Plan Document (2011) which amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development conserves and enhances the character of its environment. It would also conflict with the guidance contained in the House Extensions SPD and chapter 12 of the Framework (2021) which seeks to promote good design and requires new development to be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

16. Concerns have been raised by the appellant in respect of the Council not disclosing the third-party representations made at the time of the planning application. This is a matter between the appellant and the Council and is not relevant to my decision.

Conclusion

17. As a whole, there are no considerations that would warrant taking a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Clowes

INSPECTOR