



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2024

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/24/3350713

27 Ashby Close, Farnworth, Bolton BL4 7TS

- 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 Gulzar Ahmed against the decision of Bolton Council.
 - The application Ref is 17588/24.
 - The development proposed is proposed erection of two storey extension at side and part single part two storey extension at rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed two-storey side and rear extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and local area.

Reasons

3. No.27 Ashby Close (No.27) is a modest, two-storey semi-detached dwelling located toward the head of Ashby Close, a residential cul-de-sac. The front building line of No.27, and its attached pair (at No.29 Ashby Close), is set well forward of its neighbours and are angled on their plot, such that No.27 essentially benefits from a corner plot with a generous garden to the side.
4. A two-storey extension is proposed which would project around 3.8m from the existing flank elevation of No.27 into the side garden. It would have an overall depth of over 9m, extending beyond the existing rear elevation by around 3m. This side extension would wrap around the rear and a two-storey gable extension is proposed projecting around 6.2m across the width of the rear elevation.
5. The guidance in the Council's *House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2012)* (SPD) is that a well designed extension should be subordinate in relation to the dwelling and should be of a size and scale which is in proportion to the existing house. It further advised that overly large side extensions can completely ruin the character of the property or unbalance a symmetrical pair of semi-detached dwellings.
6. The proposed two-storey side extension has been designed so that its front elevation would be set back around 1m from the principal front elevation of

No.27 (at ground and first floor) and the ridge of the roof would be lower than its host. However, it would have a width of around 3.8m, which would be well over half the width of the existing front elevation, and combined with its depth (around 9m), it would fail to appear subordinate to its host. Whilst I accept that the proposals have been designed with complimentary materials and architectural features, rather than enhance the appearance of its host, the two-storey extensions would visually dominate it, conflicting with the SPD guidance.

7. I observed on my site visit that because of the siting of No.27 toward the head of the cul-de-sac, but set well forward of its neighbours, its existing flank elevation and all of its rear elevation (and the rear elevation of No.29) is visible in the streetscene. The proposed two-storey side extension would result in the flank elevation of No.27 being much closer to the road (some relief is currently afforded by the side garden). Although set back from the front elevation, this flank would then project a depth of around 9m into the rear gable extension. The result would be a long, blank, unduly large flank elevation, sited close to the road, which would appear unduly prominent and incongruous in the streetscene.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of corner plots where planning permission has been granted and dwellings have been extended to the side. However, save the Council's planning application reference number and an address, I have been provided with no further information to ascertain whether these examples are comparable to the appeal proposals, or offer support for them. I acknowledge that there are other examples of two-storey extensions on Ashby Close, including Nos.14, 37 and 45 referred to by the appellant. Unfortunately, No.27 is quite different to these examples in that its siting and angle on its plot means that its flank and rear elevation are already visually prominent in the streetscene; it is therefore a dwelling more sensitive to change.
9. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposed two-storey side and rear extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and local area. Consequently, in addition to the conflict with the SPD guidance, the proposals would conflict with Policy RA2 of Bolton's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) and Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024) which together require new development to enhance the townscape and respect and acknowledge the character and identity of the locality in terms of siting, size and scale.

Conclusion

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

R. Jones

INSPECTOR