



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/25/3366434

Victoria Farm Cottage, 498 Blackburn Road, Egerton, Bolton BL7 9PR.

- 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 Rachel MacGregor against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 19706/25.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey extension at the front/side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal property is located within the Green Belt. This matter is not at issue between the parties and the Council has accepted that the proposal is not inappropriate development within the Green Belt. I agree with this assessment and my decision deals solely with the reason for refusal given by the Council.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 498 Blackburn Road, (No 498) is one of a pair of semi-detached stone dwellings sited on the A666, the main road leading from and to Bolton town centre. A third stone detached dwelling is sited behind No 498 and its neighbouring attached property. Together these properties form a visually cohesive group with a high level of consistency in terms of form and materials which add to a pleasing and attractive coherence along this stretch of the A666.
5. The proposal would see the construction of a two-storey extension to the side of No 498 projecting at the front of the dwelling, with contrasting materials and fenestration to that of the host dwelling. The use of black cladding would be an incongruous feature within the setting of the traditional stone buildings and would unduly draw the eye. This would be exacerbated by the tall slim windows and doors which would further serve to distinguish No 498 from the neighbouring dwellings.

6. I appreciate that the use of materials and windows as proposed has been a deliberate choice to avoid the difficulty in achieving a 'good match' with the existing stone and would introduce a contemporary blend into the streetscene. However, notwithstanding some subservient design features, the siting of the proposed extension close to the road combined with the installation of cladding on the front, side and rear elevations would significantly detract from the traditional form and appearance of No 498. Further, despite the partial screening of the appeal site with shrubbery, views of the proposed extension would be particularly prominent when travelling in either direction due to its siting, the extensive use of cladding and the sloping nature of the road. It would appear incongruous when viewed along with the existing dwelling and the two other properties within the group.
7. I recognise that due to the side outrigger extension of the attached neighbouring dwelling, No 498 is not directly symmetrical to the attached neighbouring dwelling. However, in most views of the front elevations the two properties appear as a pair and the proposed alterations would disrupt the appearance and balance of the pair of dwellings. As such the proposal would unduly harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. My attention has been drawn to other dwellings within the wider area where contrasting and varying materials have been used. However, these are sited in an area where there is more diversity in terms of the overall appearance of dwellings in the streetscene. Other contemporary developments have also been drawn to my attention. However, in the case of the group of dwellings at Florence House, the use of cladding appears as a common feature within the overall design of contemporary new homes. Further, they form a coherent group in which context they are viewed. Of the contemporary developments closer to No 498, these are less visually prominent than the appeal site, and in the case of the dwelling drawn to my attention the cladding, including its colour, is assimilated into the style and design of the dwelling itself. The context of these developments therefore differ from the proposal before me, nor do they strongly inform the character of the area. As such they merit limited weight and do not lend me to a different view in this case.
9. Therefore, for the reasons given I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (adopted March 2024), Policy OA5 of Bolton's Core Strategy (2011) and the Bolton Council's House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2012). Together these policies require development to respect and be sensitive to particular features of the existing house including materials and style and size of windows.

Other Matter

10. The appellant refers to the handling of the application by the Council, but this is not a matter before me, nor does it alter my findings.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Winnard INSPECTOR