



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2023

by N Bromley BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/23/3319420

10 Milverton Close, Lostock, BOLTON, BL6 4RR

- 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 Muhammad Anwar against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 14377/22, dated 4 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is a small extension of front ground floor and first floor front extension above garage adding one bedroom to first floor with extension of second bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has raised concerns about the accuracy of the submitted plans and this has been included as a reason for refusal. Notwithstanding this, the Council were still able to determine the application following the submission of amended floor plans and elevation plans dated 08 January 2023, with a note on the proposed elevation plans reading "Floor Plans & Elevations Amended to Match Each Other". The plans, as amended, show the extent of the proposed development, and include dimensions on them. For these reasons, I am satisfied that the appeal can be suitably determined based on these plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached dormer bungalow, set within a suburban residential area, which includes bungalows, dormer bungalows and two storey properties. The appeal property, like many others in the street scene, has a double garage which projects forward of the main dwelling. A porch has also been added to the front elevation, which is attached to the double garage. Due to the position of the double garage and porch, they represent a prominent feature on the front elevation of the property.
5. The proposed extension would be built over the double garage and porch, whilst also extending its footprint. Although this would not affect a large proportion of the existing dwelling, it would result in a large two storey projecting front element to the building which would dominate and be at odds with the original dormer bungalow style of the property.

6. A large amount of glazing would also be introduced to the front elevation of the proposed extension, which is not replicated by any other properties in the immediate street scene. The appellant has brought to my attention an extension at a neighbouring property which has an expanse of glazing on its front elevation. However, that property is a bungalow, and that extension has a different form, scale and appearance when compared to the appeal proposal. It is also located in a different part of the street and there are limited comparisons between the two extensions. Therefore, whilst the proposed glazing element is a modern feature in itself, the amount of glazing proposed would result in the proposed extension being more visually prominent and its appearance would be a stark contrast to neighbouring properties. This would add additional harm to the appearance of the proposed development.
7. I acknowledge that the topography of the area results in the appeal property being set on a lower ground level than the road and that the properties opposite have a more elevated position. This would interrupt the views of the proposed extension and reduce its visual presence, particularly from the wider area. However, due to its scale and position on the front elevation, the proposed development would be dominant and have an incongruous appearance.
8. For the collective reasons outlined above, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the proposed development would not accord with the design aims of policies CG3 and OA4 of Bolton's Core Strategy and the House Extensions - Supplementary Planning Document 2012, which together, amongst other things, require development to be compatible with the surrounding area.

Other Matters

9. The appellant considers that the glazing feature on the front elevation of the proposed development would allow free light and heat through the glass during the winter months, which would result in an environmental benefit. However, this benefit would not outweigh the harm caused by the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.
10. The appellant has raised concerns about the handling of the application by the Council, but these are not matters that are relevant to my decision and I have considered the proposed development on its planning merits.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Bromley

INSPECTOR