



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2025

by **Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18TH February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/24/3354947

146 Chorley New Road, Horwich, Bolton, BL6 5QW

- 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 Abdol R Alikasi against the decision of Bolton Council
 - The application Ref is 18759/24.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'covered parking space'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed development on:-
 - the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area;
 - the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at nos 144 and 148 Chorley New Road in regard to outlook and sunlight.

Procedural matters

3. As I was unable to gain access to the appeal site, the site visit was carried out from the alleyway to the rear and from the neighbouring property at no 144 with the consent of those occupiers.
4. Although at my site visit I noted a sink and kitchen utensils in the structure, both the appellant and the Council refer to the proposal as a carport. I have therefore determined this appeal on the basis of a carport.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal dwelling is a traditional terraced house with no on-site parking to the front and located on a busy road with parking restrictions. To the rear is an alleyway providing access for vehicles and to the rear of the properties. Most of the dwellings have rear two storey outriggers, some have single storey extensions and a few have carports at the rear although the planning status of those is unclear.
6. The proposed development comprises a carport that has already been constructed in the rear yard of the property and is accessed from the alleyway. From the rear, the only part of the structure seen clearly is a roller shutter door in a red/brown

colour that is similar to others in the alleyway and matches the colour of the brick walls of the alleyway and the dwellings.

7. From the neighbouring property at no 144 however, I was able to see the full extent of the carport which would also be seen very clearly from the rear first floor windows of many of the surrounding dwellings, including those to the rear on Tomlinson Street. I saw that it occupies most of the rear yard, extending across its full width and most of its length, finishing very close to a rear extension leaving only a very small area of open yard. The roof and side walls are constructed of corrugated, translucent plastic sheeting with an open aspect and a white upvc fascia board facing the rear of the dwelling. The plastic sheeting extends above the existing side wall by up to 600mm or so to the height of the rear wall. This is a poor quality material that is unsuitable for a structure that is clearly seen from beyond the appeal site. Its translucent nature results in a light colour that draws attention rather than reducing its visual massing as the appellant claims. This is in stark contrast to the brown pebble dash render walls of the dwelling and the dark tiles on its main roof and to the red brick and dark roof tiles of most of the surrounding area. The extent and nature of the materials used are unacceptable in this location and the Council's objection regarding siting is therefore valid.
8. I conclude then that the development, by reason of its siting and materials, causes significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. It is, therefore, contrary to development plan policies OA1 of Bolton's Core Strategy (CS, 2011) and JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (2024) which together seek to ensure that new development respects and enhances the character of the locality.

Living conditions

9. The neighbouring occupiers at no 144 have, like most of the other dwellings in this street, a small yard to the rear of the property that provides limited space for sitting out, drying washing etc. The proposed carport lies to the south east of that yard. Given its limited height, there is only a minor reduction in sunlight to that property and as the yard has a south-west facing aspect it continues to receive an acceptable level of sunlight.
10. However, in terms of outlook, the raised height of the side boundary wall has a significantly enclosing impact given the small size of the yard as there is already a wall of a similar height along part of the opposite side boundary with a rear extension at no 142. Rather than the materials mitigating the impact as claimed by the appellant, they emphasise its presence and exacerbate its impact. I conclude that the proposal causes unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of no 144 in regard to outlook and this would be worsened if the owners of no 142 were to extend in a similar manner. As such, the proposal is contrary to development plan policy CG4 of the CS which seeks to ensure that new development protects the amenity of surrounding occupiers. I did not view the appeal site from the other neighbouring property at no 148 but the harm I have found in regard to no 144 is significant and sufficient to justify dismissing the appeal in this regard.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal is contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR