
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2025

by **S. Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/25/3369327

72, Thicketford Road, Bolton BL2 2LU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mistoria Group against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application is reference 20018/25.
 - The development proposed is for the retention of an existing, single-storey, rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal is made retrospectively for development already constructed.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon (i) the character and appearance of the area, and (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos. 70 and 74 Thicketford Road in terms of outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. No. 72, Thicketford Road is a mid-terraced, mainly brick built, two-storey dwelling dating from the nineteenth century where the evidence is that it might have been constructed originally with a rear outrigger. At some more recent date, any such outrigger has been replaced with a more modern, single storey extension with a length of approximately 3.4 metres. The appeal relates to a single storey addition to the above extension with a comparable length to it.
5. The terrace forms a line of similar houses, some with outriggers and others with single storey extensions, though with the exception of the end dwelling to the terrace at No.78 Thicketford Road, it is not the norm for these to extend outwards by as much as does the appeal development.
6. The rear amenity space is bordered by a brick wall to the back street of about 2.0 metres in height while the appealed extension has a flat roof with a maximum height of approximately 3.2 metres. The rear walls and boundaries of the other properties in the terrace have a generally similar height and appearance.

7. While the top of the appealed extension can be seen above the boundary wall, it is not visible from the main road and the extensions and additions to other properties in the terrace, notably to No. 78 Thicketford Road which forms the end to the terrace, further reduces its visibility when viewed from Canute Road.
8. Overall, I consider that the appealed extension, by its limited height, by the boundary wall and its siting relative to other adjoining additions and extensions, assimilates satisfactorily in design terms within the character and appearance of the area.
9. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal extension accords with policy RA1 of the Bolton Core Strategy 2011 (CS) which aims to protect and conserve the character and appearance of areas within which development is proposed, with policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document for Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan 2024 (PfE), and with chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2025 (the Framework) which require the same.

Living conditions of the occupiers of No's 70 and 74 Thicketford Road

10. The Bolton House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD) refers to the significant number of terraced houses in the Borough which, by reasons of age, density, size and design, are much more restricted in terms of their space available to meet the needs of their occupiers, particularly those built before the second world war which were often built without modern day facilities.
11. The SPD considers that extensions should be assessed sympathetically, while at the same time balancing other considerations such as the loss of natural light or overshadowing to neighbours, though the benefits of improving the living conditions of residents of the extended properties should attract substantial weight.
12. Bearing in mind the need to balance such matters, the SPD states that *'rear single or two storey extensions on terraced properties of up to 4 metres in length (taken from the original rear elevation of the property) will normally be considered acceptable. Single storey extensions longer than 4 metres may be acceptable if the space remaining at the end of the yard would be unusable or if the impact on the neighbour would be limited by screening – for example, where there is an existing extension which the proposal would abut in the adjacent dwelling'*.
13. The local planning authority (LPA) considers that both the original extension and the appealed extension should be considered together in relation to the above, giving an overall length of approximately 7.0 metres. The applicant considers that the dwelling, when originally constructed, had an outrigger which is now occupied by the current extension to which the appealed extension is attached. An extract from a plan of 1889 is submitted by way of evidence. As the SPD refers to the *original rear elevation*, the appellant considers that it is only the appeal extension which should be considered in relation to the SPD and with which therefore, it would accord.
14. The National Planning Policy Framework 2025 (the Framework) defines an original building as *'a building as it exists on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally'*.

15. I cannot be certain that the outrigger, if originally built with the house, was still in place on 1 July 1948, or that the current replacement extension had been constructed by that date. However, based upon my site visit and by its design and appearance, I consider that it is likely to postdate that time. On the evidence before me, I consider that the two extensions should be treated as one entity in terms of their combined length, meaning that they exceed the 4.0 metres to which reference is made in the SPD.
16. The SPD states that extensions greater than 4.0 metres in length might be acceptable in certain instances, for example, where any remaining space to the boundary of the site would be unusable. I do not consider that any such circumstances apply in this case.
17. While, in accordance with the SPD, I afford substantial weight to the improved living conditions which the appeal extension affords to the appellant in terms of additional space, the SPD also refers to the need to consider the effect upon the living conditions of neighbours, and where the LPA has refused the proposed development because it considers that it has of its adverse impact in terms of outlook and light upon the occupiers of No's 70 and 74 Thicketford Road.
18. On my site visit, and at the request of the LPA and with the permission of the occupiers, I was able to view the extension from the rear spaces of the adjoining properties.
19. No.70 Thicketford Road is situated to the west of the host property and where the two extensions combine to create a long projection along the party boundary. On my site visit, I was able to note that, by its overall length and height, it has a significantly enclosing impact upon the outlook of its occupiers, and especially when viewed from its rear amenity space, even though the appealed extension is set at an obtuse angle to the first extension.
20. I consider that this would be the case, even if the appealed extension were to be considered on its own merits, separate from the original extension to which it is attached,
21. No. 74 Thicketford Road abuts the appeal property to the east. The appellant recognises that the appeal extension would break the '45 degree rule' as included in the SPD, when a line is drawn from a window in the adjoining property. One of the stated purposes of the 'rule' is to prevent overshadowing, though other factors need to be considered.
22. In this regard, and when taking into account the arc of the sun in relation to the appeal extension, the presence of other adjoining buildings and additions and the height of the extension, I consider that the effect upon light levels for the occupiers of No. 74 Thicketford Road amounts to limited harm.
23. I conclude that the appealed extension adversely affects the living conditions of the occupiers of the dwellings to either side, substantially in the case of outlook to the one side, and to a lesser extent with regard to a loss of light on the other.
24. Therefore, the appealed extension does not accord with CS policy CG4 which aims to ensure that development is compatible with surrounding land uses and

occupants and where amenities are protected, and with the SPD which aims to ensure the same.

Other Consideration

25. The appellant has referred to another rear extension of approximately 5.3 metres in length relating to an extension to an outrigger to a two-storey house at No. 75 Castle Street, Bolton and which has been approved by the LPA. However, I do not know of the specific details of the case, though I have previously referred to the SPD which considers that there can be circumstances where a rear extension greater than 4.0 meters in length can be acceptable. In any event, I have determined the appeal based upon its individual merits.

Conclusion

26. There are no material planning considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR