



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2023

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T4210/W/23/3319506

Auldbank House, 424 Bury Old Road, Bury, Prestwich M25 1PR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Noah Fletcher against the decision of Bury Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 69244, dated 12 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is second floor extension at rear to form 1 no. flat, and roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. For the avoidance of doubt, I have used the description of development included in the Council's decision notice in the banner heading above as this is the most succinct and accurate description.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. This appeal concerns a two storey, end of terrace building located in a short commercial parade situated on a main thoroughfare in the district. There is an existing large two storey extension, with flat roof, to the rear of the property which is readily apparent in the street scene.
5. Whilst the proposal would include a pitched roof, the resultant additional massing through this and the further storey proposed, would totally overwhelm the host building. It would be a top heavy and dominant addition which would have an overly bulky appearance. Further, the prominent side elevation would appear as a blank three storey façade which lacks interest and detailing.
6. By virtue of its poor design and the substantial height of this part of the building, the proposal would be a very incongruous intrusion to the host building and would be unduly prominent in the streetscape.
7. Accordingly, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and thus conflicts with Policies EN1/2, EN1/7 and H2/3 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan (August 1997). Together, these policies aim for developments which have a high standard of design and which do not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and townscape of the locality.

Conclusion

8. The proposal would provide an additional dwelling which makes a contribution to local housing supply and would result in economic benefits during construction and on occupation. However, due to the scale of the proposal these benefits would be very limited.
9. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations of sufficient weight which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

H Ellison

INSPECTOR