



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 September 2025 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/25/3364123

14 Mobberley Road, Bolton BL2 5AW

- 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 Kieran and Lizzie Slater against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 19436/24.
 - The development is for a proposed double storey side extension, rendering of property, and skylights.
-

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 Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of Numbers 55, 57 and 61 Stephens Street and Number 175 Waggon Road with specific regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey semi-detached property, with a covered decking area positioned in the rear garden corner. It is situated within a residential area and occupies elevated ground, where the land descends steeply towards other dwellings at the rear. The appeal building therefore already exerts a dominant visual presence over these neighbours. Along the shared rear boundaries, several mature trees of considerable heights and dense canopy coverage exist. As such, those buildings to the rear are restricted to enclosed views of the appeal building and tall vegetation, as well as elevated boundary treatments and rear garden structures. However, due to the existing side gap at the appeal site and a break in the treeline between Nos. 55 and 57, partial views of the open sky are possible. These gaps are therefore an important source of unincumbered outlook.
5. The proposal would increase the overall width of the appeal building, with a ridge height matching the main roof. It would create a continuous built form that would fill the existing side gap. This would result in unacceptable loss of outlooks for the rear facing openings of Nos. 55 and 57, where views would become dominated by the full breadth of the appeal building's extended rear façade. It would particularly

affect their ground floor windows which are set much lower from the appeal site. The proposal would intensify the existing strong sense of enclosure, leading to dark and oppressive outlooks for the rooms served by these windows. The significant difference in land levels would also exacerbate the perceived scale and dominance of the appeal building and heighten its looming and imposing presence.

6. The identified harm could be extended to Nos. 61 and 175, albeit to a lesser degree. This is due to the presence of mature tree canopies which currently provide full screening of the appeal site. Even so, and should these be removed, the full extent of the proposal would become visible and may result in similar harmful impacts as previously outlined. That said, these trees appear to be well established and long standing, with no current evidence provided to suggest any forthcoming removals. Accordingly, the proposal would not result in unacceptable loss of outlooks for Nos. 61 and 175.
7. The interface distances between the original dwelling and the adjoining rear neighbours do not currently meet the guidance within the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD). The proposal would therefore similarly fall short of these. The close arrangement of the dwellings is noted as an existing situation. However, this would not justify the appeal scheme for the reasons set out above, particularly where minimum interface distances are already unmet and when there are significant differences in land levels back to back.
8. For these reasons, the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos. 55 and 57, in respect of outlooks. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document 2024, Policy CG4 of Bolton's Core Strategy, and the SPD. Together, and amongst other things, these seek for development proposals to protect and offer a high level of amenity.

Other Matters

9. I remain to be convinced that a replacement of the first floor window to a frosted glass would satisfactorily overcome the concerns I have set out, which extend to wider matters concerning the size and location of the works as a whole.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal is dismissed.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR