
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2025 by S Manson

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/25/3372815

20 Duxbury Avenue, Little Lever, Bolton BL3 1PX

- 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 Miss Jessica Taylor against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 20373/25.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'hip to gable roof extension with front and rear dormer extensions to form loft conversion'.
-

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 character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property forms one half of a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling, occupying a visually prominent position due to the curvature and incline of the road. Its rendered exterior contrasts with the predominantly brick facades of surrounding properties, further accentuating its visibility within the street scene. The area is residential, comprising two distinct dwelling types. The appeal property is defined by a shallow hipped roof, which contributes positively to the architectural coherence of the locality.
5. The proposed rear dormer window, although set slightly down from the ridge, would occupy almost the entire width of the roof slope. This would result in an overly large, boxy and incongruous addition that would significantly erode the original quality of the roof's shape, appearing disproportionately large compared to neighbouring dwellings. Although the dormer would not be readily visible from public vantage points, it would be clearly seen from the rear gardens of many neighbouring properties. This visibility from private views would heighten the perception of its scale and incongruity, thereby exacerbating the harm to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The hipped to gable roof alteration, together with the smaller front dormer, would introduce other discordant elements that would disrupt the architectural symmetry and rhythm of this pair of semi-detached dwellings. These changes would erode the balanced appearance of the roof form. The harm would be particularly pronounced given the appeal property's elevated position in the street.
7. Other local dormers are typically found on a different house type to the appeal property. These dwellings often feature single-storey front projections over integral garages, which more readily accommodate dormer additions without disrupting the overall roof form. The other examples cited were assessed in their own specific contexts, where it seems that the alterations either complemented the existing roofscape, retained hipped elements, or reflected an established pattern of development. Nonetheless, their presence does not establish a precedent for the appeal scheme on the appeal dwelling.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would thus conflict with Policy OA6 of Bolton's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) and Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024). As well as guidance contained in the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2012). Amongst other things, these seek to ensure new development respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal proposals would conflict with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR