



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T4210/D/25/3375395

15 Bishops Road, Prestwich, Manchester M25 0HT

- 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 Wells against the decision of Bury Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 71572.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a loft conversion, raised ridge and front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an altered 2-storey semi-detached dwelling situated on the west side of Bishops Road. There are community uses on the opposite side of the road. As identified by the appellant, the topography of the area is such that Bishops Road slopes from north to south with the ground floor levels of each pair of semi-detached dwellings being stepped. Consequentially, the eaves and ridge height of the pairs of semi-detached dwellings are also stepped rather than being of a consistent height.
4. The proposed development includes a roof extension which would raise the height of the property's eaves and ridge to match those of 17 and 19 Bishops Road. This neighbouring pair of semi-detached dwellings is sited at a higher ground level than the property and No. 13. The appellant claims that the height of the roof needs to be increased to create additional accommodation within the resulting roofspace to meet family needs and this would also be an efficient use of the property.
5. However, the effect of the proposed roof extension would be to visually and physically unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings comprising the property and No. 13. The ridge and eaves of the resulting property would be higher than those of No. 13 and this would result in an incongruous form of development within the streetscene. This difference in height would only be partially screened by neighbouring properties and would still be seen from the footways along both sides of Bishops Road.

6. It is noted that the council has not objected to the dormer extensions within the front and rear roofslopes and there are no reasons to disagree with this assessment. The front dormer would, however, contribute towards the unbalanced appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings.
7. Although other dwellings have been altered, there is a consistency to the height, rhythm and appearance of the stepped pairs of semi-detached dwellings within the streetscene along the west side of Bishops Road. This rhythm would be unacceptably disrupted by the proposed development. The use of matching external materials would not alter the physical difference between the roofs of the resulting property and No. 13.
8. The unacceptable harm which has been identified demonstrably is judged to demonstrably outweigh the creation of the additional accommodation within the roofspace.
9. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene and, as such, it would conflict with Policy H2/3 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan. This policy refers to house extensions and alterations being considered with regard to the external appearance of the proposal, and the character of the property in question and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR