



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2019

by R Morgan MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/19/3234944

3 Holgate Drive, Orrell, Wigan WN5 8SL

- 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 John Halliwell against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref A/19/86939/HH, dated 27 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is to extend the dwelling at first floor together with roof alterations including hip to gable conversion with first floor gable windows and dormers to the front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the description of development from the Council's decision notice (and the appellant's appeal form) which describes the proposal more clearly and succinctly than that used on the application form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located on Holgate Drive, which is a short cul-de-sac off the busier Moor Road, in an area which is predominately residential in character. Holgate Drive has two distinct sections. On turning into the road, there is vehicle repair yard and two bungalows, the first of which is the appeal property. The road then takes a ninety degree turn and continues for a short distance with four bungalows on either side.
5. No 3 is similar in design to the other bungalows on Holgate Drive, with shared design features including a steeply pitched hipped roof. However, the development in the surrounding area is mixed in character, with bungalows and houses of a variety of styles and ages, and no single building form, size or roof form dominating. As a result, there is greater scope to alter No 3 without needing to stick rigidly to a particular development form. Nevertheless, any

alterations still need to be done sensitively to avoid causing harm to the host dwelling and the wider area.

6. Whilst not raising the overall ridge height, the proposed development would lengthen the existing short ridge significantly to form a gable end on one side of the house. The existing front elevation is stepped with a section which projects beyond the main frontage. This section would be extended upwards to form a first floor, using the existing attic space. The proposed upward extension at the front of the building, together with the new side gable would add significantly to the bulk and mass of the building.
7. I accept that there are many examples of houses with hipped roofs on one side and gables on the other. However, the design of the proposed development would unbalance the property to a significant and harmful extent, creating a visually dominant front section which would appear overly large and incongruous.
8. New dormer windows are proposed on the front and rear elevation. Whilst they would sit within the existing roof plane and would be of an acceptable design, the position of the front dormer very close to the edge of the roof would appear awkward, adding to the harm to the character of the house.
9. I acknowledge that the design of the existing property may mean that it is tricky to extend successfully. However, I am not convinced that this is the only way to extend the bungalow, or that there are no other, more sensitive design solutions which could be used. Furthermore, the proposed development is not justified by future intentions for land to the side and rear of the house which do not have planning permission.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy CP 10 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy 2013 which is concerned the design of new development, as supported by the detailed guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document - House Extensions Design Guide 2019. It would also conflict with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.
11. Policy CP 17 was referred to in the Council's decision notice but this is more about environmental protection and protection of amenity and is therefore of limited relevance to this proposal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR