



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by J Moore BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/W/25/3370071

2 Greystoke Drive, Bolton BL1 7DW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Safwan Ally against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 19856/25.
 - The application sought planning permission for "To allow the rest of the front elevation of the property to be rendered in place of the brick as has been approved on the centre gable. The remaining elevations are to be left in the original brick" without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref 16356/23, dated 1 September 2023.
 - The condition in dispute is No 3 which states that: The development hereby permitted shall be constructed entirely of the materials details of which are shown on plan ref: Proposed Elevations - Drawing number SA 003, Date scanned 7th July 2023.
 - The reason given for the condition is: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is permitted and in order to comply with Bolton's Core Strategy policy CG3.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Preliminary Matters

2. Planning permission Ref 16356/23 (the original permission) was granted in September 2023 for erection of two storey extension to front and amendments to roof together with new doors to rear and alterations and render to front of property to include a dropped kerb. A subsequent application Ref 18120/24 was granted in April 2024 for a non-material amendment (NMA) to raise the central gable height by 1m and alter openings. The appealed application seeks to vary the materials condition of the original permission, such that the use of render would be increased to the front elevation. The development has commenced, but is not complete, such that the approved render and stone cladding to the front elevation as per the original permission has not been applied.
3. The address of the original permission is given as Nos 2-4 Greystoke Drive, in contrast to the appealed application and the NMA which refer to No 2 Greystoke Drive. Although I have used the address as stated in the planning application form for the appealed application in my banner heading above, I am satisfied that the appeal site is the same as that for the original permission, the NMA and the appealed application.

Main Issue

4. The reason for condition No 3 refers to Policy CG3 of Bolton's Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 (BCS). This policy requires development to be compatible with the surrounding area in terms of (among other things) local materials. Therefore, the main issue is whether the disputed condition is reasonable and necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a dwelling in a residential area. The surrounding area is predominantly characterised by two storey and single storey forms. The predominant external materials for front elevations are brick, randomised stone cladding, and hanging tiles between ground and first floor windows and within the upper parts of gabled elevations.
6. Due to the topography of the area, the appeal site is at the summit of Greystoke Drive near the junction with Whitehill Lane. The dwelling is in prominent view along Greystoke Drive and when travelling from more northerly parts of Whitehill Lane. The approved two-storey extension is largely complete and includes a projecting front gable of significant scale and height, with a vertical emphasis due to its glazing proportions. Due to this scale and vertical emphasis, together with the property's prominent location, the extended dwelling appears as a relatively imposing form within the street scene in comparison to neighbouring forms.
7. In the approved scheme, the materials would include brick and some stone cladding, and the use of render would be confined to the surround of the projecting front gable. The extent and combination of materials in the approved scheme would therefore create a degree of harmony with other properties within the vicinity, and allow the scale and vertical emphasis of the extended dwelling to assimilate into the wider street scene. This would accord with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions 2012 (SPD) which seeks to ensure that extensions are appropriate within their setting, including through the use of materials.
8. As proposed, render would be applied to the areas previously approved for brick. The proposal would result in render being the predominant material to the front elevation, in sharp contrast to the prevailing materials and appearance of other built forms in the vicinity. The increased use of render, together with the scale, height and vertical emphasis of the two-storey extension and the prominent location of the dwelling would result in an unacceptable degree of discordance within the street scene. This would conflict with the SPD and BCS Policy CG3. In addition, it would conflict with BCS Policy POA5, which among other things requires special attention to be given to the massing and materials used in new development in the North Bolton area, in which the appeal site is located. For these reasons, the proposed increased use of render would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. The appellant's grounds of appeal are founded in part upon a view that obtaining a suitable brick match has been difficult, and a photograph is included within the evidence in support of the appellant's position. However, this photograph appears to show a bricked up opening to a flank elevation, rather than the front elevation. In any event, I found the size, colour, texture and coursing of the brick used within

the front elevation to be matching and the mortar colour acceptable. For the avoidance of doubt, I was unable to inspect the mortaring technique from the public highway. Overall, I found the brickwork within the front elevation to be satisfactory within the street scene.

10. The appellant draws my attention to photographs of other properties with render within the wider area, but these are without detailed addresses. However, the addresses of these and other properties with render were indicated within the comments of the Council and interested parties. The detailed circumstances which led to the use of render at these properties are not before me, which limits the weight I can attach to these examples. The appellant's examples are some distance from the appeal site. None of the examples that I saw occupied a similar elevated and/or prominent position within the street scene, and as such I did not find them to be directly comparable.
11. For the reasons above, I conclude that the disputed condition is reasonable and necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. The proposal conflicts with BCS Policies CG3 and OA5, whose objectives I have set out above. It also conflicts with Policy JPP1 of Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 2024, which seeks to ensure development respects character and identity in terms of various factors including materials.

Other Matters

12. Interested parties raise additional concerns including (but not limited to) those about the appearance or lawfulness of other historic/recent works beyond those to the front elevation and undertaken at other properties in the area. However, these matters are beyond the scope of the proposal; and it is not the role of an Inspector dealing with a section 78 appeal to determine whether such works have been lawfully undertaken. Concerns are also raised that the proposal would lead to the use of render to other elevations of the appeal property. However, any subsequent proposal for further render would be assessed on its merits. Further concerns are raised about the management of the appeal site during construction activity. However, this matter is largely controlled by other regulatory regimes.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

J Moore

INSPECTOR