
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2020

by R Cooper BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/20/3244887

285 Wigan Road, Atherton, Manchester M46 0QA

- 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. G.P. Ingham and Ms. E.K. Jones against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref A/19/87805/HH, dated 5 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension at side of existing semi-detached dwelling with single storey extension at rear. Ground floor used for store, toilet and playroom areas. First floor used for one bedroom with en-suite to existing Bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is located within a residential street, it is a two storey, red brick, semi-detached building, and forms part of a row of three pairs of semis all similar in appearance. Each of the semis have access to the side creating a fairly even and regular pattern of gaps within the street scene. Directly opposite are a number of similar semi-detached properties which are equally spaced. This forms the prevailing character and appearance of the area.
4. Whilst the gap to the side of No 285 is slightly greater and allows for parking, the proposal is to extend right up to the boundary leaving no space to the side of the dwelling. This would not respect the rhythm and spacing between the surrounding properties and would appear out of kilter with the established pattern.
5. I note that the ridge of the extension would be lower, and the ground and first floor set back slightly from the front elevation of the host dwelling, however this would be very marginal in appearance, and would not mitigate the likely terracing effect. Furthermore, this would not reflect the design guidance for two storey side extensions contained within the Wigan Council House Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Documents (2019) (SPD).

6. I accept there are existing terraced properties in the wider area along Wigan Road, however these are sufficiently further down the street, and do not reflect the prevailing pattern of semi-detached housing directly surrounding the appeal site.
7. The adjacent bungalow at No 287 is a different house type and does have a lower roof. However, it is semi-detached with a gap to the side that contributes to the overall spacing between the properties. This would be diminished by the proposed extension, resulting in an incongruous feature in the street scene.
8. Consequently, the development would harm the character and appearance of the area and would not accord with Policy CP10 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2013), which seeks to ensure that development is of high quality design, that respects local context and integrates within its surroundings. It is also inconsistent with the SPD and design objectives in paragraph 127 of the Framework.

Other Matters

9. I have considered the personal circumstances of the appellants to provide additional accommodation, however this is a limited benefit that does not outweigh the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the area.
10. Whilst the proposal would not affect the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, this is a neutral matter, and does not affect my conclusions on the main issue.
11. I understand that an alternative rear extension was considered by the appellants. However, I am required to determine the appeal proposal before me. This does not alter my findings.
12. I have considered the examples of other extensions in the area, although I have not been provided the full details of each. In any event I am required to determine the proposal on its own merits based on the evidence before me.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

R Cooper

INSPECTOR