



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025

by **K Mansell BA (Hons) MPhil TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T4210/D/25/3361222

20 Thurston Close, Bury BL9 8NW

- 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 Howard Powsney against the decision of Bury Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 71258.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed two storey front porch extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Thurston Close is a small residential cul-de-sac of detached and semi-detached red-brick houses with relatively consistent architectural features, including vertical sections of render, cladding, or tiles, and curved front bays and similar window proportions. Despite slight variations in building line, the setback behind open gardens or driveways contributes to a reasonably cohesive street scene.
4. The appeal property at No 20 is a two-storey house at the end of the cul-de-sac. It shares a driveway with 22 Thurston Close, accessed from the turning head with a fully hard surfaced front garden. In appearance, it resembles the adjoining semi at 18 Thurston Close, particularly in terms of the use of materials, window proportions, and a front porch. The appeal scheme would replace the existing single storey porch on the appeal property with a two-storey front extension.
5. The double height extension would project noticeably beyond the appeal property's front elevation. Consequently, even though the site is neither within a Conservation Area nor a designated heritage asset, and the front gabled design would reflect other dwellings on the road, it would be a prominent addition due to its scale and position. Being to the front of the house, it would also be visible from many vantage points along the Close on the approach to the turning head. As a result, it would perceptibly alter the character and appearance of the dwelling within the street. Even the use of full height ground floor glazing, matching render and roof tiles and a living wall would not mitigate this harm.

6. The extension would also be splayed at ground floor level so that it would not overlap the boundary line shared with No. 22. It has been put to me that this configuration would enhance vehicular manoeuvrability within the curtilage of both properties. However, there is no substantive evidence before me, such as a swept path or parking plan, to support this claim and the existing arrangement appears to have been in situ for some time. In any event, I observed no other two-storey front extensions in the street, and given its visibility from the road, the proposal would appear incongruous and harmful to the character of the street scene.
7. My attention has been drawn to other extended properties in the locality. Those at Hillsborough Drive and Randale Drive do not obviously appear to include a double-height front extension. The two-storey extension to the front of 136 Parkhills Road mirrors that on the adjoining semi at No 134, incorporating window proportions that match the host dwelling. The house at 126 Parkhills Road is detached, and the front extension sits between two bay windows. For these reasons, on the evidence presented, I do not find these cases to be directly comparable with the appeal proposal. In any event, I am required to reach conclusions based on the individual circumstances and merits of this appeal.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy H2/3 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan (1997), which requires development to, amongst other matters, be of a proportion and appearance that has appropriate regard to the character of the area. It would also conflict with guidance within the Council's Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties Supplementary Planning Document 6 (2010), which includes a presumption against large front extensions and advice that any front extensions should respect the street scene.

Other Matters

9. I recognise the benefits of the proposed scheme in providing improved living space to the front of the house, located away from the commercial unit at the rear. However, personal circumstances seldom outweigh more general planning considerations, particularly where development would be permanent. Moreover, my assessment is confined to the appeal scheme before me. It does not extend to considering alternative methods for achieving additional accommodation.
10. I also acknowledge that no third-party representations were received. However, neither this, nor the absence of any identified harm by the Council to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, nor the intention to use sustainable methods of construction, justify development that would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
11. Concerns regarding the manner in which the application was considered by the Council fall outside the scope of this decision.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole, and in the absence of material considerations to indicate otherwise, the appeal is dismissed.

K. Mansell

INSPECTOR