



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2025

by **David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/25/3371042

Oak Lodge, Morris Farm, Pocket Nook Road, Bolton, BL6 4HW

- 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 Mr M Razaq against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 19878/25.
 - The development proposed is erection of dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by an amended version on the decision notice. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.
3. The submitted evidence indicates that the dormer has been built and that the application was submitted retrospectively. The proposal was in place at the time of my visit.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - Character and appearance of the host building and the area; and
 - Living conditions of residents of Oak Stables in respect of privacy and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site consists of a collection of farm buildings that have been converted to residential use. These buildings have retained an understated character that reflects their previous use.
6. The dormer is located on a roof slope to the side of the host building. The flat roofed design and the extent of the dormer results in a box-like addition that dominates the roof slope. Although it is located to the side of the host building, the dormer is prominent in views on the approach to this group of buildings. Due to its design, scale and location, the dormer appears as an obtrusive feature that does

not respect the sloping roof of the host building or the simple rural character of this group of buildings.

7. Planning permission has previously been granted for dormer windows on this roof slope. However, these were 2 separate dormers of a smaller scale which broke up their massing within the roofscape, and they also included pitched roofs which complemented the roofscape of the extant buildings. The previously approved dormers do not therefore establish a principle for a dormer of the design or scale of the appeal proposal.
8. There is a flat roofed dormer on the rear elevation of the building. But this is not as prominent as the appeal proposal, and does not establish a prevailing context for this side dormer. The use of materials that match the host building would also not mitigate for the unacceptable scale and design of the proposal.
9. I therefore conclude that due to its scale, design and location the proposal will lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the area. The proposal will therefore be contrary to the design and character requirements of Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 2024 (PEJDP) and Policy OA4 of the Core Strategy 2011. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice of the Supplementary Planning Document – House Extensions 2012 (SPD) with regards to the subordinate design of dormers.

Living Conditions

10. The windows of the dormer enable views into the windows of habitable rooms of Oak Stables, including a dining room on the ground floor and a bedroom at first floor. In these circumstances the SPD recommends a separation distance of 21m, and even allowing for a degree of flexibility the appeal proposal would have a separation distance significantly below this. The appellant contends that the first floor bedroom of the adjacent property is not a main room. However, it is a habitable room and occupants can expect an appropriate degree of privacy, and comments from Oak Stables specify that the room is a main bedroom. Due to this proximity and arrangement, the proposal would lead to an unacceptable loss of privacy for residents of Oak Stables.
11. The appellant emphasises that the proposal would use top-hung obscure glazed windows to protect the privacy of neighbours. However, the submitted plans and the development as built include side opening windows, which when open would enable a direct view of Oak Stables. That said, the use of top-hung windows could be ensured by condition.
12. However, the use of obscured glazing would remove the outlook from the bedrooms served by the proposed windows, which would lead to gloomy and oppressive accommodation for occupants. Whilst the obscured glazing would allow a degree of natural light to enter the rooms, this would not mitigate for the lack of outlook. Due to this harm, I do not consider that it would be appropriate to require the retention of obscured glazing by condition.
13. The dormer windows previously approved at the site would have used obscured glazing. However, the Council's Officer Report specifies that that permission has lapsed. It has therefore not been demonstrated that the previously approved dormer windows on this elevation can be implemented as a fallback scheme.

14. The Council refers to the overbearing effect of the proposal on the outlook from Oak Stables. However, even allowing for the limited separation distance, the proposal would be viewed against the bulk of the host building. On that basis I do not consider it would lead to an unacceptable overbearing impact.
15. Notwithstanding my conclusions in respect of outlook, I conclude that the proposal would lead to significant harm to residents of Oak Stables due to loss of privacy. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the amenity and privacy requirements of Policy JP-P1 of the PEJDP and Policy CG4 of the Core Strategy. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice of the SPD with regard to separation distances between main room windows.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR