



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: 10th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/25/3358353

101 Crescent Road, Bolton BL3 2JS

- 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 Habib Ulrehman Shahbadi against the decision of Bolton Council.
 - The application Ref is: 19110/24.
 - The application is for erection of single storey front extension together with first floor extension at 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.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a mid terrace house within this long row of similarly aged and designed houses. The buildings are generally architecturally refined with well proportioned fenestration, stone heads and cills, dentilled style eaves details and deep red brick facing materials. To the rear the houses each have their own rear yard or garden that has access off a rear lane. The appeal property already has a single storey, flat roof, rear outshut extension as have several other properties nearby.
5. The proposal before me is effectively of two separate elements. Firstly, the proposal seeks permission to build upon the existing single storey rear outshut extension with a pitched roof, single bay extension to create a first floor bedroom. This extension would echo at least one other nearby and would be of a traditional design and materials.

6. The second element of the proposal seeks permission to alter the front of the existing house with a modest lean too type extension also in brick in order to give around 1m of extra floor space to the existing living spaces.
7. It is generally common ground between the parties that the first floor extension to the rear would be acceptable and, subject to a condition relating to the proposed side window at first floor, would not cause undue harm to either the character or appearance of the area, nor the living conditions of neighbours.
8. Although I generally concur with this assessment and consider that the proposed rear extension would be unlikely to cause such harm, I was unable to fully inspect the site to the rear of this property and as such I am unable to thoroughly assess the potential for impact upon neighbours here. As such I am unable to offer a split decision in this regard whereby I allow this element of the appeal.
9. The proposed front extension however would cause a noticeable and significant disruption to the front façade of the house. This façade is read within its context as a uniform and largely consistent front terrace with a strong building line. Although there have been some slight modifications to this elevation on other properties the addition of a ground floor lean too here would alter this uniform appearance and introduce a moderately harmful addition to this front elevation.
10. As such, I find harm to the character or appearance of the area through this proposed single storey front extension that would harmfully affect the uniform and generally consistent appearance of the streetscene here to the detriment of the area. As a result, this element of the proposal would be contrary to Policies JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and Policy RA1 of the Bolton Core Strategy.

Conclusion

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

A Graham

INSPECTOR