



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: 09 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/24/3350802

17 Stapleton Avenue, Bolton BL1 5ES

- 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 Abdul Ahmed against the decision of Bolton Council.
 - The application Ref is 17874/24.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a second storey front extension, single storey front extension with canopy, part first floor part two storey side and part single part two storey rear extension together with alterations to the roof to form habitable rooms and associated external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

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.
3. I have utilised the description of development from the decision notice as this more comprehensively describes the proposal than that provided on the application form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises of a large, detached dwelling which is situated on a road that contains large properties that extend across most of the width of their respective plots. The buildings are of varying designs but are generally two storey and formed of red brick walling material in combination with render. Some of the properties have front gable features at roof level, but apart from these, they generally comprise of clear roofscapes. This built form together with established planting within garden areas and grass verges with street trees, provides for a pleasant, verdant residential character to the area.
6. The appeal proposal seeks various extensions, including a turret feature at second floor level. This would contain a large amount of glazing and appear as a prominent addition on the front elevation. Whilst the existing turret is a defining

feature at the front, it has a hipped roof form that assimilates with the main roof of the appeal dwelling. The proposed turret feature however, due to its heightened position as well as its use of glazing would be at odds with the roofscape of the appeal and other properties in the area. I was able to see front gables at roof level on nearby properties, including on 16 Stapleton Avenue opposite the site, but these gable features do not however have glazing at second floor level.

7. The proposed development also includes a two-storey element with a double gable design at the rear. Whilst this part of the proposal extends across the rear elevation and also contains large areas of glazing, including to the gable features, it is not as prominent as the changes to the front elevation, despite views of it from neighbouring gardens and open land at the rear. It would be seen in the context of the rears of neighbouring properties where there is typically greater diversity in the built form.
8. Nevertheless, I conclude that the proposal overall would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host building and the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and Policy OA4 of the Council's Core Strategy, which seek, amongst other matters, to conserve and enhance the character of the existing physical environment. It would also be contrary to the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2012) and Paragraph 135 of the Framework, which seek, amongst other matters, development that is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

9. The proposed development would provide additional accommodation to support multi-generational living, at a time of rising house prices and living costs. The caring needs of elderly parents who are registered disabled are also set out. The appeal development would be beneficial in these regards, but it has not been demonstrated that it is the only means to address these issues and needs, particularly as the harmful front turret feature is a relatively small part of the overall accommodation proposed. Consequently, I attribute limited weight to this matter.
10. The appellant has referenced a number of dwellings along Stapleton Avenue that have had planning applications approved, and also similarities between houses in the streetscene. None of these cited examples however have large front glazed features within the gable at roof level. Those developments will have been considered on their own merits, and I can confirm that I have done the same on this appeal.
11. Reference has been made to amendments to reduce the amount of glazing proposed, but this appeal follows the Council's decision, and I am required to determine it accordingly. The appellant has made reference to permitted development rights that could be used to variously extend the house, but none of those rights have been shown to provide for the proposed front turret feature that would be harmful for the reasons set out in this decision.
12. There would be no adverse issues arising in relation to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and the property would retain much of its garden space, but these are neutral matters and not ones which weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

13. 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