



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2023

by M Clowes BA (Hons) MCD PG CERT (Arch Con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10TH August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/23/3321159

104 Seymour Road, Bolton BL1 8PU

- 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 Yasin Buksh against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 14062/22, dated 26 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'roof pike.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Yasin Buksh against Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The appeal property consists of a replacement dwelling permitted under application 01419/17. The Council advises that the dwelling was not constructed in accordance with the approved plans due to the provision of the 'roof pike' which is the subject of this appeal. The description of the proposal laid out on the planning application form is used in the banner heading above but reference to 'retention of,' has been removed as it is not a form of development. Since the development has been carried out, retrospective planning permission has been sought. In reaching my decision I have assessed the development as shown on the submitted plans and not as built on site. I am aware that the appeal site is the subject of an Enforcement Notice. This has no bearing on the consideration of the s78 appeal before me.

Main Issue

4. The main issue of this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling within a primarily residential area. There is some variety to properties within the wider street scene given the length of Seymour Road, with variety in age, style and height including Victorian villas and terraces, inter-war semi-detached dwellings and more modern infill development. However, the appeal site forms a cluster of similarly designed semi-detached properties within this section of Seymour Road.

6. Reference is made to the guidance contained within paragraphs 3.1 and 5.1 of the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD), which state that a well-designed extension should be of a size and scale which is in proportion to the existing house and, sited and designed so as not to have an unacceptable effect on the wider street scene or character of the locality.
7. The group of similar semi-detached dwellings of which the appeal site forms part, share a uniform building line and an overall symmetrical form including hipped roofs, despite some alterations over time including the introduction of differing facing materials and the addition of porches.
8. The appeal site no longer matches its attached neighbour at No 106 Seymour Road in scale or appearance following the previous approvals to extend and then replace the host dwelling¹. I also acknowledge that the roof pike is a relatively modest extension and proportionally it is a subservient addition to both the front elevation and roofscape of the appeal site. Nevertheless, the roof pike due to its vertical and forward projection adds a jarring feature that breaks the plane of the roof, contrary to the prevalent pattern of uninterrupted hipped roofs. In this regard it results in an incongruous addition at roof level, exacerbating and emphasising the unbalanced composition of the pair of semi-detached properties to which the appeal property belongs. The effect of this is particularly evident in views close to the site within Seymour Road as well as those from Ventnor Avenue and whilst such views are relatively localised it does not diminish the harm that is exerted within the street scene.
9. For the above reasons, the development has an adverse affect on the character and appearance of the area, as described above. As such it would fail to comply with Policies CG3 and RA1 of Bolton's Core Strategy; Development Plan Document 2011 which seek amongst other things, to ensure that development has regard to the overall built character and quality of the area including the street-scaping of existing housing, objectives shared with the SPD.

Other Matters

10. Photographs of dwellings at Highgrove Close, 62 Hill Cottage Road, 635 Crompton Way and 65 Ashworth Way have been presented to illustrate that roof pikes are found elsewhere within the Bolton area. Nonetheless, all of the examples provided relate to detached properties that are not located within the same context as the appeal site and thus they are not comparable. Gable roofs and roof pikes are common architectural features used in historic as well as contemporary buildings. However, that does not justify the inclusion of one here, where the context is of simple, uninterrupted hipped roofs belonging to semi-detached dwellings.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, and all other considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

M Clowes

INSPECTOR

¹ Arising from the planning history of the appeal site including the erection of a 2-storey and single storey side and rear extension (application reference 95906/16) and a subsequent approval for a replacement dwelling (01419/17).