



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2023

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30TH November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/23/3329813

301 Cox Green Road, Egerton, Bolton BL7 9UX

- 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 Elizabeth Jones against the decision of Bolton Council.
 - The application Ref 15851/23, dated 20 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of a front porch, first floor side extension with dormer to front, conversion of existing garage together with erection of single storey attached garage to side and pitched roof to existing single storey, flat roofed rear extension together with roof amendment to existing side dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a front porch, first floor side extension with dormer to front, conversion of existing garage together with erection of single storey attached garage to side and pitched roof to existing single storey, flat roofed rear extension together with roof amendment to existing side dormer at 301 Cox Green Road, Egerton, Bolton BL7 9UX in accordance with the terms of the application, 15851/23, dated 20 April 2023, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations, drawing number CGR/PL/23/001, dated March 2023; Existing Site Plan, drawing number CGR/PL/23/002, dated March 2023; Proposed Site Plan, drawing number CGR/PL/23/003, dated March 2023; Site Location Plan, dated 13/03/2023.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice as this provides a fuller, more accurate, description of the development before me than the description provided in the planning application form.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area; and on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.15 Torra Barn Close, with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. No.301 Cox Green Road (No.301) is a detached, brick-built two-storey dwelling, with a steep pitched gable (with side dormers) facing Cox Green Road. It has a large flat roof single-storey extension that wraps around the side and rear, incorporating an integral garage, bedroom and living accommodation.
5. To the side, it is proposed to extend over this single-storey extension, continuing the ridge and eaves of the existing gable with a dormer window in the new front roof slope. This would significantly increase the scale and massing of the dwelling. However, the extension has been designed so that it is offset from the existing gable, thereby ensuring it remains subordinate to the original dwelling and retains the prominence of the characteristic steep pitched gable.
6. No.301 is at the end of a row of detached dwellings on the south side of Cox Green Road of a similar design. Cox Green Road is a reasonably narrow road with a footpath only on the south side. Travelling in either direction the streetscene is characterised by the large facing gables of the row of dwellings which provides a rhythm and uniformity. I also observed on my site visit that most have been altered and/or extended such that there is variety in their appearance, fenestration details and materials. By setting the first floor extension off the gable, the proposal would not particularly change or upset the rhythm of roof forms. There are other examples of similar side extensions (albeit of a lesser width) and whilst it may appear prominent when travelling from the south, the proposed extension would not be out of character, or cause harm to the appearance of the wider area.
7. It is proposed to construct a porch which would project forward of the existing front building line (of the gable) by around 900mm. This would have a flat roof which would align with the eaves and soffits of the roof of the proposed side extension and attached garage. It would further reflect the flat roof detail of the proposed front dormer. Rather than resulting in an awkward mix of roof lines, the proposed porch contributes to the horizontal emphasis and cohesiveness of the front elevation; an approach I find appropriate and sympathetic to the host dwelling.
8. To the side elevation a pitched roof dormer is proposed, located centrally in the roofslope of the gable, broadly in the location of the existing dormer. It would have a similar width to the existing, but would sit closer to the eaves and ridgeline. Although larger in scale, given the extent of the roofslope, it would not appear a disproportionate addition. I recognise that existing dormers on Cox Green Road typically have a flat roof and therefore a pitched dormer would differ in character. It would, however, be set well off the front edge of the roofslope and whilst it would be visible within the streetscene, it would not be unduly prominent. Nor do I find a pitched roof to be so different to appear

'vastly uncharacteristic' in the wider area, which as I have described above has some variety in fenestration and detailing.

9. The row of dwellings on the south side of Cox Green Road are all brick built and there is therefore continuity in materials. In the wider area, including Cox Green Road itself and the cul-de-sacs to the south, there is more variety in materials including natural stone, different coloured brick and render. It is proposed that the extension would be rendered and the appearance of No.301 would therefore inevitably differ from its immediate neighbours. However, I do not find that the use of render would appear particularly incongruous given the wider context that I have described, or cause harm to its character and appearance.
10. Therefore, on the first main issue, I conclude that the scale, form and massing of the proposed extension to No.301, and the use of render, would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, or wider area. Consequently, there would be no conflict with policies CG3 and OA5 of Bolton's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) (CS) which, amongst other things, require development to be innovative, contribute to good urban design, conserve the character of the existing physical environment and be compatible with the surrounding area, in terms of scale, massing, form and materials. It would further accord with the guidance in the Council's *House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2012)* (SPD) that the design of house extensions should not have an unacceptable effect in the wider streetscene or on the character of the locality.

Living conditions

11. To the south of No.301 is a short row of three two-storey dwellings on Torre Barn Close. The rear gardens of these dwellings share the side boundary of No.301 and face its existing flank elevation, which angles away from the boundary. The southern corner of the existing wrap around single-storey side and rear extension to No.301 is very close (only around 0.5m) to that boundary and the rear garden of No.15 Torre Barn Close (No.15).
12. The proposed first floor side extension would align with the existing rear gable of No.301, so would not extend the full depth of the existing single-storey extension up to its southern corner. Rather, the flat roof at this point would be replaced with a fairly shallow pitched roof. The effect of this is that the height and massing of development on this corner would not significantly increase, and, because of the existing orientation, is angled at around 45 degrees away from the boundary with No.15. Whilst I accept that No.15 is at a slightly lower level than No.301, and it has main rooms on its rear elevation, because of its design the proposed extension would not appear unduly overbearing such that it would cause a harmful loss of outlook for these neighbours.
13. There would, therefore, be no conflict with CS Policy CG4 because the proposed extension would be compatible with surrounding land uses and occupiers, protecting amenity. Nor would it conflict with the SPD guidance as there would be no change in distance between the extension (existing or proposed) of No.301 and the rear elevation of No.15.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard condition regarding the implementation of the planning permission, I have also attached a condition specifying the approved drawings in the interests of certainty.
15. In the Appeal Questionnaire the Council have suggested additional conditions in respect of the submission and approval of details relating to 3no. car parking spaces and the retention of the proposed garage for the parking of motor vehicles. Save to ensure vehicles are left clear of the highway, the Council have provided no justification for why these conditions are necessary, nor have I been provided with the CS Policy or Supplementary Planning Document to which the conditions refer. Given this is a householder extension, which would only increase the number of bedrooms in the dwelling from 3no. to 4no. and replace an existing garage, I do not find these conditions to be necessary. Further, I do not find it necessary for a landscaping scheme to be submitted for a proposal of this scale nature and scale. The conditions have therefore been omitted from this decision.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR