



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2025

by **L Fern BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: **11 MARCH 2025**

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/24/3355115

10 Milverton Close, Lostock, Bolton BL6 4RR

- 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 Muhammad Anwar against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 18857/24.
 - The development proposed is ensuite bedroom on top of the existing garage and rebuild one of the existing bedrooms on top of the existing porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development differs between the application form and Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council's (the Council) decision notice. The description in the banner heading above has been taken from the application form, which adequately describes the proposal that is before me.
3. The appellant, in their grounds for appeal, has suggested the imposition of a condition to alter the proposal to change the design of the existing dormer. This would constitute an amendment to the proposal that is before me and was before the Council during the application process. The Householder Appeal Service does not allow Councils to comment on appellants' grounds for appeal and in the interests of fairness I have based my decision on the proposal as set out on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. Milverton Close is a relatively long residential cul-de-sac located in a suburban area. A variety of detached house types and styles are present on Milverton Close, including two storey dwellings, and traditional and dormer bungalows. The area immediately surrounding No 10 Milverton Close (No 10) is characterised by the presence of bungalows, both adjacent to the property and opposite. No 10 is a dormer bungalow that, like other properties in the immediate vicinity, has a front projecting single-storey double garage, in this case with a hipped roof design. A porch has also been attached to the side of the garage.

6. The proposed development is for a first-floor extension above the existing garage and porch, with the ridge line of the appeal proposal perpendicular to that of the host property. The gable end of the extension, incorporating a large window, would face onto Milverton Close. Part of the existing garage would remain forward of the extension. There is no proposed increase in the footprint of the property.
7. The proposed extension constitutes a large upper-storey addition to what is presently a modest dormer bungalow, set adjacent and opposite to similar properties. Due to its scale and front projecting nature, the extension would appear at odds with its surroundings and dominate the street scene, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
8. Whilst it is recognised that the appellant has decreased the scale and massing of the extension when compared to previous planning proposals, the proposal that is before me remains of a scale that would dominate the street scene and be an incongruous addition in a setting that is largely characterised by dormer and traditional bungalows.
9. It is acknowledged that the appeal site is set at a lower ground level than Milverton Close and the bungalows opposite, which would have the effect of marginally reducing the extension's dominance in the street scene. However, the effect would be minimal given the scale of the extension and its resultant prominence within the street scene.
10. The large amount of glazing proposed to the front elevation of the extension, which is acknowledged to have been reduced in scale from previous planning proposals, is out of character with its immediate setting. The appellant has drawn my attention to the significant amount of front elevational glazing at No 15 Milverton Close (No 15) as an example of a similar development in the area, which was observed during my site visit. The property is in a different locational context to the appeal site and is therefore not comparable.
11. The extensive proposed window at No 10 would also be at odds with the existing property in terms of design and scale, to the detriment of its appearance. The window's modern design would appear at odds with the existing traditional style windows of the host property, creating a confused elevational design and reducing the property's positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
12. For the above reasons, I find significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, contrary to policy OA4 of Bolton's Core Strategy (2011) and policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document for, amongst other locations, Bolton (2024). These policies seek to improve the built environment by ensuring development respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality and integrates effectively with its surroundings.

Other Matters

13. The appellant refers to a property at the junction of Ashcroft Close and Kilworth Drive as an example of a dormer bungalow alongside a gable ended property, which was observed on my site visit. However, the property is located a substantial distance from the appeal site and is not contextually similar.

Conclusion

14. The proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Fern

INSPECTOR