



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 April 2025

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/25/3361015

63 Sharples Avenue, Bolton, BL1 7HE

- 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 Mrs Khadijah Vali against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 19298/24.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing single storey side extension and erection of a two-storey side extension and part two storey/part single storey rear extension together with single storey extensions at front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mrs Khadijah Vali against Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council and this is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. Prior to the application the subject of this appeal, three recent planning applications relating to the appeal site were refused by the Council¹. Amongst other things, each of these applications included the demolition of the existing single storey side extension and the erection of a two-storey side extension and a part two-storey/part single storey rear extension.
4. The appellant considers that revisions made further to these previously refused applications would result in the proposal the subject of this appeal comprising an acceptable form of development.
5. It is the appellant's consideration that the Council has acted erroneously and that the only reason the application the subject of this appeal was refused "is because of a failure of the Council to determine the application with due process." I note above that an application for costs is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

6. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

¹ Reference: 18814/24; 17645/24; 16205/23.

Reasons

7. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey brick-built extension to the side. It is situated in a prominent position at the corner of Sharples Avenue and Holden Street and is set back from the road behind a low fence and front garden.
8. The appeal property has a garden to the rear, at the end of which is a single storey garage, accessed from Holden Street, which runs alongside the side of the dwelling and its rear garden. Holden Street continues towards the main entrance to a primary school.
9. The surrounding area is residential. It is characterised by the presence of brick-built semi-detached dwellings with slate roofs. Dwellings are set back from the road, generally behind low brick walls or fences, front gardens and/or parking areas and have larger gardens to the rear.
10. Houses along the street appear similar in design and this, the common use of brick and slate and the regular set-back from the road all combine to provide the area with an attractive sense of uniformity. Further, the presence of gardens and gaps between dwellings contributes to the surrounding area's sense of greenery and spaciousness.
11. I observed during my site visit that whilst both the appeal dwelling and Number 61 Sharples Avenue, on the opposite side of Holden Street, have been extended to the side, both extensions are single storey in height. In addition, there is garden land between these single storey additions and Holden Street. These features provide the entrance into Holden Street from Sharples Avenue with open and spacious qualities.
12. Also, during my site visit, whilst I noted that many dwellings in the area have been altered and/or extended, I observed that such changes generally appear in keeping with host dwellings, as well as with the character of the surrounding area.
13. Sharples Avenue itself rises quite steeply from east to west. In this way, the topography of the area adds to the prominent appearance of the appeal property within its surroundings as one travels up the hill.
14. The proposed development would comprise a large and bulky addition. It would extend significantly to the side at two storey height and the roof would only be set down marginally from the main ridge. The ground floor element would step forward to the front and a large front porch would project further towards the road.
15. Consequently, the proposed development would appear as an unduly dominant feature and this would not be mitigated to any significant degree by the setting back of the side extension's first floor element. Rather, the overall height, width and scale of the proposal would combine with its overall bulk in such a manner that it would overwhelm and fail to appear subordinate to, the host dwelling.
16. In addition to the above, I find that the two-storey side extension would severely erode the open and spacious qualities of the entrance into Holden Street and would appear as an incongruous feature, out of keeping with the area's uniform qualities.
17. The harmful impact of the above would be exacerbated as a result of the considerable projection of the side extension to the rear. The extent of this

projection would combine with the height of the proposal, its close proximity to Holden Street and the visual prominence of the appeal site when seen from the east, to result in the proposal dominating its surroundings in an obtrusive manner.

18. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (2024); and to the Council's House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR