



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2025 by S Jamieson BA(Hons) MPlan

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/25/3364058

55 Heywood Park View, Bolton BL3 6RL

- 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 & Mrs Ilias & Jihan Rashid - Atec Design & Renovation against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 19683/25.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two-storey extension at rear of the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - a) the character and appearance of the area; and
 - b) the living conditions of occupiers of 53 Heywood Park View (No 53) and 57 Heywood Park View (No 57), with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a mid-terrace property, situated on a modern housing estate comprising similar terraces of two storey dwellings. The front of the appeal terrace faces out onto an area of open space. The rear of the terrace faces on to garden areas which in turn back on to a parking court and garages. Other than the rendered host dwelling, surrounding properties are predominately red brick, punctuated with occasional horizontal cladding. There is further uniformity across the estate in terms of the low-pitched roofs and in the size, siting and design of windows, doors and porches. Some dwellings on the estate have been extended. On Heywood Park View, however, such additions are exclusively single storey.
5. The two-storey rear extension would project substantially beyond the rear elevation of the existing terrace and, due to its height and width, would largely engulf the rear elevation of the host dwelling. Its mass, including the substantial blank flank elevations, would appear conspicuous when seen from neighbouring properties,

the car park and footpaths to the rear of the terrace and from the junction of Heywood Park View with Lever Drive. In combination with the proposed hipped roof, which is not characteristic of the estate, this would detract from the general uniformity of the terrace and the extension would appear as a bulky and incongruous addition.

6. The Council's House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) generally considers two storey rear extensions of the appeal proposal's depth to be acceptable. However, and regardless of whether the dwelling is double fronted or not, the orientation of the terrace and layout of the estate in this case means the proposed development would be more prominent in the public realm than is typical for rear extensions. As a result, it would have a more pronounced visual impact and, given the consistency and visibility of the terrace, the extension would not appear subordinate or of a size and scale that is proportionate to the host. Therefore, it would not accord with the overall guidance in the SPD.
7. For the above reasons, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it would conflict with Policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024) (DPD), Policy RA1 of the Bolton Core Strategy (2011) (CS) and the SPD (2012) which, amongst other things, require that development respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size and scale and seek to ensure developments have particular regard to massing.

Living conditions

8. Due to its height, depth and siting next to the shared boundaries with No 53 and No 57, coupled with the limited width of the rear gardens in this row, the flank elevations of the two-storey extension would appear dominant and overbearing when experienced from the nearest windows and the rear gardens of these neighbouring properties. The Council suggests that the proposal would also breach the 45-degree rule outlined in the SPD from the nearest habitable windows at both No 53 and No 57. This has not been disputed by the appellant. The 45-degree rule seeks to maintain an adequate outlook for occupiers of neighbouring properties and this breach further indicates that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect.
9. Thus, the proposal would harm the living conditions of No 53 and No 57, with particular regard to outlook. It is therefore contrary to Policy JP-P1 of the DPD, Policy CG4 of the CS and the SPD, which require developments to protect and offer high levels of amenity.

Other Matters

10. I note the appellants' comments regarding the progression of properties over time and the right to extend under permitted development, and I agree that development proposals should be considered on a case-by-case basis. Indeed, I have assessed the proposal on the basis that planning permission is required and is applied for in this instance. For the reasons set out under the main issue, it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
11. My attention has been drawn to development at 51 Heywood Park View. However, this example relates to a single storey extension and is therefore not directly comparable to the appeal scheme. I also acknowledge the similarly scaled and orientated two storey rear extension which was granted permission at 55 St Mark's

Walk (No 55). From what I have seen it had more typical rear aspect which was not as visible from the street and so not all material considerations were comparable to the appeal proposal. In any case, these examples do not lead me to another conclusion having regard to the site-specific factors described and the harm identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR