



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/24/3348547

2 Sefton Lane, Horwich, Bolton BL6 6HJ

- 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 Jonathan Smith against the decision of Bolton Council.
 - The application Ref is 17747/24.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey extension to form garage together with a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice as it is a more succinct, accurate description of the development proposed than the one provided on the planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is whether sufficient information has been provided to properly assess the proposed development.

Reasons

4. The Council's issue in this case is that insufficient information has been submitted by the appellant to enable a proper assessment of the planning application against the relevant policies of the development plan. In this regard, Section 7(1)(c) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the Order) states that a general requirement of applications for planning permission is (i) a plan which identifies the land to which the application relates; and (ii) any other plans, drawings and information necessary to describe the development which is the subject of the application. Any plans or drawings required to be provided by Section 7(1) of the Order must be drawn to an identified scale.
5. The Council have provided a list and copies of nineteen plans which they state were under consideration at the time the application was decided. These include duplicates of the same floor plan or elevation – so, for example, I have been provided with four versions of the proposed front elevation – but the sequence in which plans were submitted has not been provided, nor

confirmation as to whether plans were in fact superseded by others. It is clear from the appellant's evidence that plans were amended during the course of determination of the planning application but a number of plans have no title block, a drawing reference or a revision number and therefore unfortunately the sequence of the submission is unclear.

6. The Officer's Report in respect of the application states that '*A request for further information has been unsuccessful and therefore the LPA are unable to undertake an accurate assessment of the proposal,*' but I find it unfortunate that the Council did not engage proactively with the appellant during the course of the planning application to resolve any discrepancies in respect of the plans. It is also disappointing that these issues were not raised during the course of validation of the planning application, given that an identified scale and individual reference, version number and date of production, forms part of the Council's '*Validation Requirements for Planning Applications (2023)*.' I therefore share the appellant's frustration.
7. A number of plans have been annotated as being a scale of 1:100 but the print paper size is not given. Despite this, using the scale bar, I have endeavoured to reconcile the dimensions given on the proposed Ground Floor Plan with the proposed elevation plans, particularly in respect of the width and depth of the proposed two-storey extension. Whilst I note that appellant states that the plans are digitally created with accurate measurements on them, there do appear to be discrepancies between the measurements on the PDF format plans that I have before me.
8. I observed on my site visit that a single storey rear extension is being constructed to the rear of the appeal property, which is similar to the appeal proposal before me, although the window and door alignment relative to the eaves differs. This enabled me to ascertain, to some degree, the scale and dimensions of the proposed two-storey extension. However, I also observed that there are ground floor windows (albeit at a high level) and a first floor window on the flank elevation of No.2 Old Greenwood Lane and accurate measurements (particularly to the rear boundary) are required to properly assess the effect on neighbours. I am not satisfied that I have these on the plans before me. Further, in the absence of accurate plans it would be difficult for neighbours or the Council to determine whether the proposed extension had been built in accordance with any planning permission granted.
9. I therefore conclude that the information submitted is not sufficient to satisfy myself that the proposed two-storey extension accords with policies OA4 and CG4 of Bolton's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) or Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024). Together these require new development to be compatible with surrounding land uses, and conserve, respect and enhance the character of the existing physical environment.

Conclusion

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

R. Jones

INSPECTOR