



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2024

by L C Hughes BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U4230/W/24/3342669

551 Bolton Road, Swinton, Salford M27 8QT

- 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 Atiq Khan, MRK Hospitality Ltd. against the decision of Salford City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/82416/FUL.
 - The development proposed is front glazed restaurant extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a restaurant and takeaway, which the Council indicates is located approximately 300m from Bolton Road Local Centre and approximately 470m from Swinton Town Centre. There are no concerns regarding the principle of the development. The immediate area is characterised as a busy thoroughway with a mix of residential, commercial and retail properties. The restaurant and takeaway is the end property on a row of terraces set back from the road, which includes a hot food takeaway and a domestic appliance retail unit and showroom.
4. Despite the varied mix of uses and design, the majority of the surrounding terraced rows of retail and commercial properties are set back from the road and their fronts are typically aligned to give a predominately flush front appearance and a uniform building line.
5. The proposed front extension would have a contemporary feel, constructed utilising a grey aluminium frame and fascia board, and would incorporate a large element of glazing. Plans indicate that the proposed extension would measure approximately 13.8m wide, 3m deep, 2.9m high and have a floor area of 37.5m².
6. The proposed extension would be single storey and due to the property's position set back from the road it would not encroach onto the footpath. However, its overall size and position forward of the front elevation would create a prominent projection which would reduce the openness of the street,

and being set forward of the established building line, would not relate well to the surrounding buildings and pattern of development.

7. Whilst there is diversity in surrounding shopfronts and signage, and the existing building is undistinguished architecturally, the large structure added to the front would be disproportionate to the host building. The glazing would avoid a dominant expanse of brickwork, but the proposed structure, due to its bulk and forward position, would be visually intrusive when viewed along Bolton Road. The extension would therefore look out of character for the area and overly dominant in this section of the street scene.
8. My attention has been drawn to a similar extension along Monton Road. I am mindful that consistency in the planning process is important and like cases should be decided in a like manner. Whilst it is inevitable for comparisons to be made, each will have its own site-specific circumstances and merits upon which it is considered, and a specific relationship with the street scene, the host property and surrounding properties. I do not have the exact details of that permission before me, but I note that there are similar developments in the nearby vicinity of the extension at Monton Road. As such, the development does not have the same impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area as the appeal proposal, and I do not find it to be directly comparable to that which is before me, which would be an isolated, imposing extension in a prominent position.
9. As such, I find, that the proposed development would conflict with Policies D1, D2, D3 and D8 of the Salford Local Plan (2023) which together seek to ensure that development enhances the surroundings; protects, enhances and responds to the positive character and distinctiveness of the local area; does not unduly dominate the townscape; and respects the scale of the original building. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters and Planning Balance

10. I recognise that the Council did not have any concerns regarding the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of nearby residents with regard to noise and disturbance and highway and parking impacts. However, such lack of harm means that these are neutral matters within the planning balance.
11. I note comments that the area is currently not well maintained, and that the proposed development would help improve the area and change its perception. However, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal represents the only means of developing the site or improving the local area and so I give this matter limited weight.
12. The proposed development would provide social and environmental benefits in terms of increasing the capacity of the restaurant and takeaway in a sustainable and accessible location and would be supported by the local community. The proposal would also bring economic benefits during the construction phase and through the creation of new jobs. I give these matters considerable weight. However, the Framework sets out that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. I have found that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

This harm would be long lasting and would be contrary to the design aims of the Framework. I ascribe this matter significant weight. The benefits of the proposal, in this instance, do not therefore outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

L C Hughes

INSPECTOR