



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2023

by C Rafferty LLB (Hons), Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T4210/D/23/3323378

7 Crosfield Avenue, Bury, Ramsbottom BL9 5NX

- 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 Ewan Perry against the decision of the Council of the Metropolitan Borough of Bury.
 - The application Ref 69310, dated 2 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The site is a detached bungalow with accommodation in the roof on the eastern side of Crosfield Avenue. The area is residential, with a variety of dwelling types on the street. However, those on the eastern side share a level of consistency in that, despite additions and alterations, first floor development is largely set back. This allows the front gabled features present in this group of properties to remain prominent and readily appreciated. In addition, there remains a somewhat shared similarity in the external materials present along the street, providing a sense of visual consistency in this regard.
4. The proposal is a two storey side extension at the property in addition to external alterations, including zinc cladding to the first floor and roof and render to the ground floor and part of the existing front elevation. It would inevitably alter the current proportions of the property and result in additional bulk at the site. While this would be constructed largely within the existing footprint of the dwelling and would not increase the height beyond the existing ridge it would nevertheless be a sizeable addition that would fail to respect or reflect the character and proportions of the dwelling.
5. While the ground floor front gabled projection of the property would be retained, the additional built form at first floor, flush along the current footprint, would overwhelm this level of the property. It would reduce the visual prominence of the upper gable and result in the property appearing out of place within the immediate group of dwellings where this prominence has largely been retained. The property would appear top heavy and imbalanced.

While it would be set back in the site, which has a wider frontage than others in the street, the overall dimensions of the site remain modest. As such, the proposal would read as a cramped and contrived form of development.

6. In addition, certain external elements would result in the property appearing incongruous both at the site and within the wider context. The zinc cladding, while limited to parts of the upper levels and interrupted by glazing, would fail to reflect the predominant external materials of the street. It would dilute the consistency in external materials in the immediate vicinity and, when taken together with the first floor-wrap around window, would provide an overtly modern external design that would not successfully integrate in Crosfield Avenue, appearing visually jarring in context.
7. For the reasons given, the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. It would fail to comply with Policy H2/3 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan (1997) and Supplementary Planning Document 6 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties (2004, updated 2010) insofar as they seek to ensure house extensions and alterations are sympathetic with the original building and surrounding area.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has referred to examples in Crosfield Avenue and the wider area of properties with contrasting external materials. While this is noted, it remains that the precise use of zinc cladding in this instance would appear out of place. In any event, each proposal is decided on its own site-specific circumstances and reference to development elsewhere carries little weight.
9. The proposal would provide an additional bedroom, ensuite and family bathroom with a kitchen-diner, utility room and two reception rooms, providing additional living accommodation and contributing to the housing mix of the area. It would also address the current poor insulation of the property, with the zinc cladding and roof tiles being sustainable and durable. These benefits of the proposal are noted. However, given the overall limited contribution made in these regards, even when taken with the limited weight given above to the presence of surrounding development, this would not outweigh the harm identified to character and appearance.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, the proposal would not accord with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Rafferty

INSPECTOR