



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February, 2025

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/24/3357328

21 Sonning Drive, Bolton BL3 3RA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Kantilal Khimani against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is: 18582/24.
 - The application is for retrospective consent for raising the roof to construct a second floor at the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Procedural Matter

3. Since the determination of this application a revised National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published on 12 December 2024 (updated 7 February 2025) whose main focus was not directly relevant to this appeal. Nevertheless, I have determined this appeal in accordance with the revised provisions within the Framework.
4. The description of development differs from that used on the original application form and instead reflects that used by the council in their decision notice. This is in light of the council's description better reflecting the actual proposal at hand.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a modern detached house within a wider residential estate of similarly styled houses of a similar age. Most properties exhibit common features such as a combination of brick and render and some with Mock Tudor architectural details. Although there is some inevitable variation within the estate, generally the materials, architectural forms and features are synonymous to some extent.
6. The appeal property represents one such house type that is of two storeys with partial rendered front elevation to the first floor. The house exhibits a long

sloping roof to its right hand side that contains a pitched roof dormer within its roof slope that accurately reflects some of the other suburban designs in the area. The siting of the house is adjacent to an area of amenity land that demarks the end corner of Sonning Drive. This area of land is publically accessible and contains trees and some ornamental rocks. According to the Appellant the site has recently been tidied and was previously an area that attracted anti social behaviour.

7. The property maintains a rear garden with a high screen fence demarking its boundary from other properties and from an area of woodland to the rear beyond which are more houses, one of which is a three storey pitched roof dwelling.
8. For whatever reason alterations were made to this house without the benefit of planning permission and as such certain unauthorised changes were carried out to the property. These largely consisted of the erection of a flat roof extension to the top floor of the building in order to substantially increase rooms within the roof space. This has in effect created a full height extension to the rear of the house.
9. Unfortunately, presumably due to the required head height levels involved, this has resulted in an awkward encroachment over the front right hand roof slope which has resulted in a vertical upstand at the top of what was the existing ridge line. As a result the extension is visible not only from the rear and sides but also from the front.
10. In assessing this appeal I am aware of the Council's Policy JP-P1 and the Council's House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) both of which reflect the Framework in their requirement for good design. The SPD also explicitly discourages flat roof extensions and encourages such extensions to be subordinate to the principal house.
11. Although there is some variation within the area, the vast majority of houses here abide by a similar architectural approach. Despite the rear extension being carried out in a good match of brick to the original house it does not abide by the requirements of the SPD and does significantly alter the character of the existing house. Nowhere is this alteration more harmful however than through the awkward and poor design detail where the roof of the extension is visible above the existing ridgeline and from the streetscene view of the gable elevation.
12. Despite some trees offering some seasonal visual shielding of this elevation, such a detail is harmful and ill conceived and it causes significant harm to the more subtle architectural details that predominate in the area. When added to the mass and expanse of the rear elevation, which has, in effect created a new second floor flat roof extension, the harm is even greater.
13. Although I accept that the effects upon neighbours through overlooking would not be noticeably worse than that of the previous situation, the increase in massing and dominance of this extension could cause greater harm.
14. Ultimately this alteration has caused significant harm, especially through its awkward and poorly designed raising of the roof here. As such the scheme is clearly contrary to Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development

Plan aswell as the guidance contained within the Household Extensions SPD and the Framework itself. As such this appeal must fail.

Other Matters

15. I understand that the extension was required for a relative who has learning and physical difficulties. However, although I give this largely personal matter great weight it is insufficient to justify the poor design of the extension or to outweigh the very real harm that has been caused to the streetscene and the character of the area due to this scheme.

Conclusion

16. As such, for the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR