



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 December 2024

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/24/3351087

3 Hollins Drive, Bolton BL2 1DH

- 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 Dr Mengnan Guo against the decision of Bolton Council.
 - The application Ref is 17986/24.
 - The development proposed is a proposed double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024. I have considered the changes and as they are not material to the proposal, further comments were not sought by the parties. I have, however, determined the appeal having regard to the revised Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 1 Hollins Drive with regards to outlook.

Reasons

4. The two-storey proposal would be situated to the side of the existing dwelling and extend up to the common boundary with 1 Hollins Drive. This neighbouring building has a ground floor glazed opening which is situated around 9.7m from the proposed extension. Given this close proximity, where the direct outlook would be on to the two-storey side wall of the proposed extension, the proposal would have an unacceptable overbearing impact on the living conditions of these neighbouring occupants.
5. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable harmful impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 1 Hollins Drive with regards to outlook. As such, it would be contrary to Policy CG4 of the Council's Core Strategy and Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, for new development to be compatible with surrounding land uses and occupiers, to protect amenity. It would also be contrary to the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2012) which seeks an interface distance of 13.5m between a neighbouring elevation which contains a main room window and a facing wall of a two-storey extension.

Other Matters

6. I note the reference by the appellant to previous crimes involving the theft of a car. The proposal would include a garage that would enable a car to be kept in a secure place, and this therefore weighs in favour of the proposal, as does the provision of further accommodation on the first floor. These matters would not however outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the neighbour's living conditions.
7. Although reference has been made to there not being any objections to the extension, representations have been raised by a neighbour citing various concerns with the proposal. The matters raised do not however alter my conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

8. I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the development plan as a whole, and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a decision other than in accordance with this. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR