



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 June 2024 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MRTPI MIEMA CEnv

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/24/3339191

Cranberry Farm, Plodder Lane, Bolton BL5 1AP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Atiq Khan against the decision of Bolton Council.
 - The application Ref is 17011/23.
 - The development proposed is described as 'double storey front porch.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was published between the determination of the application and the appeal. The relevant parts as far as they relate to the main issue have not however changed. The main parties would not therefore be prejudiced by me taking the current iteration of the Framework into account. I have proceeded on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal building is a large detached two-storey dwelling. It is close to but set back from the road. The success of its design, and how it presents to the street scene specifically, relies heavily on symmetry and consistency with an even fenestration rhythm, size and hierarchy and two pitched roof dormers. There is also a single storey pitched roof porch over the centralised front door which exists as a recessive, subservient and unifying feature along with the dormers. The span of the building, its street frontage position and large plot result in a prominent presence in the street scene.
6. By effectively adding a storey to the existing porch, it would become a dominant feature of the front elevation and compete with the scale of the building as a whole. It would disrupt the positive contribution the existing much

smaller porch makes to the design of the building overall and how it shares a similar scale relationship with the dormers. Further, it would introduce a much larger window opening with mismatched header design in the first floor which would jar with the existing much smaller ones and disrupt the pleasant consistency of the front elevation in terms of size, design and hierarchy. These harms would be exacerbated by the size, siting and prominence of the exiting building.

7. In terms of the two examples in the appellant's evidence, they both appear more as front gable features of a holistic and consistent front elevation and share similar window sizes and designs with their host. They are therefore sufficiently different from the proposed development, and I am not persuaded therefore to recommend allowing the appeal in light of them.
8. With this and the above in mind, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, there would be conflict with Policy CG3 of Bolton's Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011, the Framework and the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2012. These, amongst other matters, require development to be compatible with the surrounding area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan. There are no other material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that may indicate a decision other than in accordance. I therefore recommend the appeal is dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence, and my representative's report, and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR