



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: 8th July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/25/3363874

18 Riefield, Bolton BL1 6TA

- 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 Hafsa Patel against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 19331/24.
 - The development is described as a 'retrospective application for works to boundary wall. Previous wooden fence panel wall removed and replaced with brick and panel wall (more aesthetically pleasing and safer), due to a number of break ins and for the safety of the homeowners. Homeowner was not aware planning was required. New wall approx 200mm taller than previous wall proposed. Canopy to front'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of boundary fence and its replacement with a brick wall, together with the erection of a canopy at the front at 18 Riefield, Bolton BL1 6TA, in accordance with the terms of application, Ref 19331/24 and the plans submitted with it.

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description on the application form, which is set out in the banner heading above, is lengthy and includes words which are not a description of development. I have therefore based the description with the appeal decision on the more concise description on the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form.
4. The Council consider the front canopy element of the development to be acceptable. From my own observations of the appeal scheme, I have no reason to form a different view. This recommendation therefore focuses on the brick wall element of the development, which I saw on my site visit is already in situ.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the brick wall on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property is a detached dwelling occupying a corner plot on a cul-de-sac. The surrounding area comprises similar brick built properties, which are commonly separated from the pavement by grass verges, hedges, driveways or low-profile brick walls. Despite the prevailing open character of frontages, there are

some limited examples of taller brick boundaries in the street scene as well as brick side elevations of garages sited close to the highway. The section of Riefeld that the appeal dwelling sits side on to has a verdant character, largely owing to the grass verge and dense vegetation which lines the opposite side of the street.

7. The Bolton House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) seeks to avoid new walls and fences on open plan estates. However, the photographic evidence before me shows that a dwarf wall and a close boarded fence previously lined the side boundary of the appeal site with the street and that the side and rear of this corner plot were not previously open.
8. The wall is only slightly higher than the fence it has replaced. The upper sections include black fence panel inserts which are set back from the brick parapets helping to break up the mass. Furthermore, the close proximity and elevated level of the host dwelling relative to the street help to reduce the perception of the wall's scale. The visual blending of the wall against the side elevation of the dwelling is further aided by the use of matching brickwork in line with Paragraph 5.13 of the SPD guidance. Moreover, as the wall reduces in height and given its limited extent next to the plot frontage, it retains a suitable openness to the plot. These factors, taken together with the verdancy of the land opposite which softens the overall vista down the street, assimilate the development into its immediate surroundings.
9. For the above reasons, the development has an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it complies with Policy OA5 of the Bolton Core Strategy (2011) and Policy JP-P1 of the Greater Manchester Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (2024) which, amongst other things, seek development which respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used and to ensure that development conserves and enhances the character of the existing physical environment.

Conditions

10. Save for the canopy which was not in place at the time of my visit, the development is already substantively complete. Given my findings that the development is acceptable in character and appearance terms, planning permission is granted in accordance with the plans submitted with the application and no further conditions are necessary in this instance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Russell INSPECTOR