



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2020

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/19/3243923

8 Duddon Close, Standish, Wigan WN6 0UJ

- 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 Lloyd Davies against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref A/19/87723/HH, dated 14 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a hip-to-gable loft conversion with increased height roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. Part E of the appeal form states that the description of development has not changed and neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Notwithstanding this, the decision notice and appeal form used a more detailed description, that the development proposed is the "installation of a new roof with increased roof height, conversion from hipped roof to gable ends and dormer to rear together with new roof lights and external alterations". The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. No 8 Duddon Close is a two-storey detached house, built of red brick with blue engineering brick details, with a red-brown tiled hipped roof with front gable. It sits within a modern estate and, while there is some variety of material and detailing, including the type of roof, among the houses in the surrounding area, for the most part the scale, massing and height of the dwellings is similar.
5. The proposal is to convert the loft to provide two additional bedrooms and a bathroom. This would result in the roof ridge being raised in height by about 1.1m and the existing end hips being converted to gables. A gable dormer

would be installed on the rear roof slope, with a smaller apex above a new feature window on the front elevation.

6. The estate within which the appeal property is situated on gently sloping land, and there is some change of levels within Duddon Close itself. As a result of this, and the variations in detailing between dwellings, the roof ridges of No 8 and its neighbours are not at exactly the same level. Nonetheless there is a broad consistency in the scale and massing of the buildings, and their height relative to the street. The increased roof height and the added massing of the hip-to-gable conversion would result in the loss of this consistency, as would the bulky rear dormer which, while not visible from the street, would be readily seen from neighbouring homes and gardens. The proposal would not comply with advice in the Council's 2019 House Extension Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document in respect of roof extensions, and the development would lead to the host dwelling being incongruous within its surroundings.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to several extensions and other developments nearby. I do not have full details of the circumstances that led to these proposals being accepted, and it is not clear that any is directly comparable to the current appeal, which I have of course determined on its own merits. However, although very close to the appeal site, No 11 Duddon Close is in the corner of a small side-arm of the cul-de-sac, and so although it appears similar in scope to the proposal before me it has a different relationship with its surroundings and the impact on the street is limited. The example at No 16 appears to be of a smaller scale than the appeal proposal as, although the height of the roof above the garage was raised it did not add to the overall height of the dwelling as a whole. The erection of a new dwelling adjacent to No 29 Duddon Close is clearly a different type of development to the appeal proposal, while it is does not appear that the extension permitted at No 18 Hartington Drive was ever built. The conversion at No 3 Hartington Drive appears to be on a similar scale to the current proposal, but in my view the increased roof height and massing have put that house at odds with its surroundings and do not justify allowing a similar development in this case.
8. I conclude that the proposal would lead to the host property having an increased bulk and massing which would be detrimental to its appearance and that of Duddon Close, and as a result it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies CP10 and CP17 of the 2013 Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy, which among other things seek to ensure that new development respects the character of its locality, is well-integrated with its surroundings, and improves the quality of place in the borough.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector