



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 August 2023

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/23/3320523

90 Chorley Old Road, Bolton BL1 3AE

- 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 Shehzad Hussain against the decision of Bolton Council.
 - The application Ref 14370/22, dated 3 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is existing dormer façade and windows to be covered in matching roof tiles as per existing. Proposed new windows at rear gable end.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's Delegated Report refers to a porch and dormers at the appeal property being subject to ongoing enforcement action. I do not, however, have any further information before me on this matter and I note that planning permission has only been sought for alterations to the dormers (rather than the dormers themselves), as shown as Existing on the planning application drawings. I have therefore considered this appeal on the basis of the application made and the proposals before me, namely the replacement of the existing dormer windows with roof tiles and installation of new windows in the rear gable end.
3. The Council have taken no issue with the proposed new windows in the rear gable end and I have no reason to disagree with this conclusion.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the alterations to the rear dormers on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

5. No.90 Chorley Old Road (No.90) is a two-storey, mid-terrace dwelling which has a two-storey outrigger that extends toward Back Bayley Street which runs along the rear of the terrace. The outrigger is taller and projects further rearwards than others in the terrace and the existing dormers are located either side filling much of the roof plane.
6. The guidance in Bolton's *House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2012)* (SPD) is that the construction of dormer windows in the roof should not

normally result in the proposed dormer occupying more than one quarter of the roof plane which faces a highway or which is otherwise prominent in the wider streetscene. This is to ensure that the characteristic and visual appearance of the roof and overall balance in design is maintained.

7. I observed on my site visit that because of their size and location on either side of the roof plan of the outrigger, the dormers are very prominent in the streetscene, visible in both directions along Back Bayley Street and also from Mortfield Lane. The façade and windows of the dormers are proposed to be covered in roof tiles that would match the main roof of No.90, however, the lack of any fenestration or articulation of the façade would only serve to increase the visual bulk and mass of the dormers. They would continue to appear unduly prominent and incongruous in the streetscene.
8. The appellant's evidence refers to other dormer windows in the same terrace as No.90, and the adjoining terrace on the opposite side of Mortfield Lane. Save photographs and the observations on my site visit, I have no further information on these dormers, but I note that they are constructed on the rear roof slopes on their host properties (rather than the outrigger) with glazed windows. I do not therefore find them to be comparable to the proposal before me, which in any event falls to be judged on its own merits.
9. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the alterations to the dormers would cause harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to policies CG3 and RA1 of Bolton's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) which together require development to have regard to the overall built character, conserve the distinctive character and be compatible with the surrounding area. It would further be contrary to the SPD guidance referred to above and the design guidance in Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

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

R Jones

INSPECTOR