



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 December 2025

by **J Smith MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/W/25/3374809

2A Lenham Gardens, Breightmet, Bolton BL2 6HN

- 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 Tyler Entwistle against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 20638/25.
 - The application sought planning permission for erection of single storey extensions at front and rear without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref 18450/24, dated 19 June 2024.
 - The condition in dispute is No 3 which states that: Notwithstanding the submitted details, the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall be of a similar colour, texture, and size of those of the existing building, and shall be retained thereafter.
 - The reason given for the condition is: To ensure the development fits in visually with the existing building and safeguards the character and visual appearance of the locality and in order to comply with policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (2024).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. Planning permission was previously granted in 2024, subject to conditions. Condition 3 of this permission required the external surfaces of the extensions allowed in this permission to be of a similar colour, texture and size of those found on the existing building. The appellant contends that the approved drawings clearly detailed that render was to be utilised on the external elevations. The appellant subsequently questions the imposition of this condition in light of the above, suggesting that it should not have been included in the decision notice.
3. However, the crucial word in Condition 3 is 'notwithstanding', thus requiring the materials to be used to match the existing building, notwithstanding the detail contained on the approved plans. The application which relates to this appeal requested to vary Condition 3 to allow a render finish to be used. The application was subsequently refused.
4. It therefore follows that the main issue is the effect of the proposed material upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. 2A Lenham Gardens occupies a prominent corner position at the junction of Lenham Gardens, Cheriton Drive, and Sandhurst Drive. The site benefits from extensive visibility due to the large areas of open space along both Sandhurst

Drive and Cheriton Drive. The buildings which occupy Lenham Gardens are predominantly constructed in brown brick. Within the wider visual context, red brick dwellings are also evident.

6. Consequently, the prevailing character of the locality is defined by the use of brown and red brick. The introduction of render at such a prominent location, to extensions which are highly visible from public vantage points would therefore appear incongruous, contrasting sharply with the established material palette of the immediate surroundings.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to several properties in the locality that have been rendered. However, during my site visit, I observed that these examples are largely concealed behind terraced rows and are not readily visible from the appeal site. This contrasts with the highly prominent corner position of the appeal site. More significantly, the Council has confirmed that no planning permission has been granted for the rendering of these elevations, and no convincing evidence to the contrary has been submitted. Accordingly, these examples carry very limited weight in my decision.
8. Reference has also been made to the former Oasthouse Public House, now occupied by retail units, which incorporate a variety of signage and advertising. These features and the uses found in this building, however, are not directly comparable to the use of render under consideration. Finally, it has been suggested that the existing bricks cannot be easily matched. I note that the appeal building is constructed in typical brown brick, a material that is not unusual.
9. In conclusion, given the prominent location of the appeal site within an area characterised predominantly by red and brown brick buildings, the proposed use of render would cause harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding locality. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan, 2024), Policy RA3.8 of the Bolton Core Strategy (2011), and the guidance contained within the Bolton Council House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2012). Collectively, these policies and guidance require new development to respect and reinforce the established character and identity of the area, with the choice of materials identified as a key consideration.

Conclusion

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

J Smith

INSPECTOR