
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/25/3364009

65 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 approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Chris Wilson against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 19745/25.
 - The development proposed is a single storey flat roof rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would be permitted development under Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached, two storey dwelling, with a single storey attached garage. It is within a residential area comprising mostly two-storey, semi-detached properties. The proposal relates to a single storey rear extension, which would measure approximately 4 metres in depth, 6 metres wide and 3.27 metres in height. It would have a flat roof and be constructed of brick work to match the existing house.
4. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse, subject to limitations and conditions.
5. Paragraph A.1 of the GPDO states that development is not permitted by Class A if (i) the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would be within 2 metres of the boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse, and the height of the eaves of the enlarged part would exceed 3 metres. The 'Permitted Development Rights for Householders: Technical Guidance' states that in respect of flat roof extensions, the eaves height is measured from the ground level at the base of the outside wall to the point where that wall would meet the upper surface of the flat roof.
6. In this particular case, the proposed extension would be within two metres of the boundary to the neighbouring property. The proposed rear extension would have a flat roof and measure 3.27 metres in height. Therefore, the eaves height of the proposal would exceed three metres in height.

7. Consequently, the proposal would therefore fail to meet the specific requirements outlined in Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, paragraph A.1.(i) of the GPDO and would not constitute permitted development.

Other Matters

8. My attention has been drawn to a prior approval which was granted by the Council for a was granted for a single storey rear extension which was 3.62 metres Long and 3.32 metres maximum height. However, I have not been provided with any further details of this approval. Therefore, I cannot be certain whether it is comparable to the appeal proposal. Furthermore, for the reasons set out above I have found that the proposed extension fails to comply with the conditions and limitations of the GPDO and is not therefore permitted development. The approval of other schemes would not alter these findings.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would not be permitted development as provided for by Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO and the appeal should be dismissed.

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR