



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2020

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/20/3258931

12 Lime Grove, Lowton WA3 1HQ

- 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 J Orbison against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref A/20/89325/HH, dated 11 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is to erect a first floor side extension above a previously erected single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension above a previously erected single storey extension at 12 Lime Grove, Lowton WA3 1HQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref A/20/89325/HH, dated 11 June 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following submitted plans: drawing numbers 2019/842-01, 2019/842-02 and 2019/842-03.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached, two storey hipped roofed dwelling located at the junction of Lime Grove and Lynwood Avenue. The host building has an existing single storey side extension. The side elevation of the side extension and the first floor side gable of the building face towards Lynwood Avenue. Though set forward of the front building line of dwellings along Lynwood Avenue, the side elevation of the single storey extension is set away from the side boundary of the appeal site and the host building is

positioned centrally within the plot with front and rear garden areas. The prominent corner position of the appeal site means that the front, side and rear elevations of the host building are visible from surrounding roads. The immediate surrounding area is residential in character comprising dwellings of various design and appearance.

4. Although the existing and proposed side extensions to the host building project beyond the front building line of properties on Lynwood Avenue, the rear garden of the host building means that there is some distance between it and the nearest dwelling on Lynwood Avenue. In addition, the front elevation and front roof slope of the first floor extension would be recessed from the main front elevation and roof slope of the host building meaning that it would appear subordinate when viewed from the front and side and would not be an overly dominant addition. These factors together with the fact that a reasonable gap would remain between the side elevation of the extension and the side boundary with Lynwood Avenue means that whilst the extension would be relatively prominent and visible within the streetscene it would not be incongruous or harmful to the general character of the area.
5. In reaching my decision I note the advice regarding side extensions on corner plots contained within the Council's SPD¹ that such extensions must not encroach beyond established building lines and that blank gables are not generally acceptable. However, I note that the overall purpose of the SPD is to ensure that extensions do not have an adverse effect on the house itself or on the quality of a streetscape or neighbourhood. I also note that the SPD does not appear to be adopted guidance with the copy provide to me being a draft for consultation dated April 2019. This limits the amount of weight to be given to the advice in the SPD.
6. Notwithstanding the specific advice in the SPD, for the reasons stated above, I conclude that the proposed first floor extension would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It therefore accords with Policy CP10 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy adopted September 2013 and with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that new development is integrated effectively with its surroundings and helps to create attractive places. Although the proposal is not fully in accordance with all of the specific guidance in the SPD, it does accord with the general purpose of the SPD to ensure that extensions do not adversely affect streetscapes.

Conditions

7. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provide certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the extension to be constructed in materials to match the host building. This is having regard to its scale and position and to ensure that the character and appearance of the area is protected. I have not imposed the suggested condition which seeks to control the addition or alteration of windows as this does not appear to be necessary having regard to the position of the host building in an established residential area and noting that certain restrictions relating to windows already exist within the GPDO².

¹ House Extension Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document

² The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR