
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2019

by C Coyne BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/19/3233329

20 Lawnswood Drive, Tyldesley, Manchester M29 8NG

- 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 and Mrs B Miller against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref A/19/87074/HH, dated 14 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 04 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is rear and side two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The issues raised by this appeal are: the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and the effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated within a street consisting of two storey semi-detached dwellings. The surrounding area is predominately residential comprising a mixture of two storey and single storey dwellings within a suburban setting. Each set of semi-detached dwellings on the street have driveways which sit within the gaps between them. These gaps contribute to the character and appearance of the street.
4. The proposed development would create a two storey side and rear extension along the shared boundary with no. 18 Lawnswood Drive. The Council's adopted House Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which supports Policy CP10 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy (WLPCS) requires that for two storey side extensions that the first floor element be set back by 2 metres. The first floor element of the proposed extension would only be set back by approximately 1.5 metres from the front of the appeal property.
5. Furthermore, the SPD also discourages extensions that would abut the shared boundary in order to avoid a 'terracing' effect when both neighbouring properties develop similar side extensions with a gap of 800 millimetres (mm) from the shared boundary being required. The proposed extension would leave a gap of approximately 200mm. Given its overall design and close proximity to

the shared boundary with no. 18 the proposed extension would contribute to a 'terracing' effect.

6. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Whilst I note the difference in the levels between the two neighbouring properties and the fact that the ridgeline of the proposed roof would be lower than the original building, I do not consider this to be sufficient to offset the harm to the character and appearance of the area.
7. With regard to highway safety, the SPD requires that one off-street parking space be provided for residential developments with up to three bedrooms. The proposed development would not result in the loss of the existing off-street parking space and would therefore conform with the SPD. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would not cause harm in relation to highway safety.

Conclusion

8. Whilst the proposed extension would meet the off-street parking requirements set out in the SPD, this would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would conflict with Policy CP10 of the WLPCS (adopted September 2013) as supported by the SPD (adopted June 2019) which both aim to promote good design. It would also conflict with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires good design.
9. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Coyne

INSPECTOR