



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/20/3260325

59 Kilburn Drive, Shevington, Wigan WN6 8BW

- 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 L Smith against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref A/20/88987/HH, dated 16 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion including rear dormer and hip to gable conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a single storey semi-detached dwelling that forms part of a residential townscape group of matching properties. In plan form, each pair of semi-detached properties forms an 'H' shape with a linking hipped roof section flanked to either side by long front-to-rear wings with pitched roofs and front and rear gable ends. The roofs of the wings are set below the hipped roof ridge line. Properties are evenly spaced and set back on consistent building lines behind front gardens enclosed by low boundary walls.
4. The proposed increase in the height of the hipped roof would create a discordant step in the ridge line between the adjoining properties. The raised roof would extend sideways across the pitched ridge of the wing and it would finish in a gable end that would not respect the hipped roof form of the pair of properties. The flat-roof box dormer that would extend backwards from the elevated and extended roof would be a substantially large feature. It would be bulky and dominant and it would not relate well to the appeal property or to the surrounding built form.
5. The rear of the proposal would not be prominent from public viewpoints. However, irrespective that No 59 is slightly elevated above the street, the front and side extensions and alterations would be readily visible. The proposal would disrupt the harmonious roofscapes and consequently the street scene. It would be conspicuous and discordant and it would not make a positive contribution to a sense of place or to local townscape character which, although not of significant architectural merit, is nonetheless distinctive and coherent. It

would be an incongruous feature that would not be sympathetic to, nor would it integrate with, the surrounding built environment.

6. The alterations and extensions to the rear and sides of the property would be readily visible to the neighbouring occupiers to either side. In this regard, although it would detract from the appearance of the appeal property, there would be no loss of privacy or significant overshadowing and the diminished outlook would not be significantly harmful to the neighbouring occupiers.
7. Photographs have been provided that show roof extensions elsewhere in the area. One relates to a semi-detached dwelling with a simple roof. Although the other relates to a flat roof dormer extension to a similar property to No 59, it is on a sloping street such that there would already be a step in the ridgeline between the pair of properties. In any case, neither scheme provides a visual context for the appeal proposal and it is not clear whether or not they benefit from planning permission or were considered in the same policy context. Therefore, I cannot be certain that they are directly comparable to the appeal scheme or that they provide a justification for it.
8. Therefore, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the design and residential amenity aims of Policies CP10 and CP17 of the Wigan Council Local Plan Core Strategy Adopted September 2013. It would conflict with the Wigan Council House Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document Adopted June 2019, including in relation to alterations to roof ridges where there is a distinctive group roof form and to dormer extensions that unbalance pairs of semi-detached properties. It would conflict with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

9. The plans illustrate that the appeal property already provides a reasonable standard of living accommodation for a family. Therefore, while the enhanced living accommodation would be a benefit to the appellant and his family, it would not result in any significant benefit in terms of the local housing stock.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that harm. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR