



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2021

by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/20/3263810

60 Pemberton Road, Winstanley, Wigan WN3 6DA

- 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 and Mrs Andrew and Janet Pennington against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref A/20/89758/HH, dated 17 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

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 street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with an attached garage to the side. This part of Pemberton Road is formed of pairs of symmetrical semi-detached properties although the pairs differ from one another in terms of their roof and fenestration designs. Houses here are set well back from the highway by both deep grass verges and generous front gardens. Most properties in the area have single storey side additions that either adjoin or are very close to each other. There are also some examples of two-storey side extensions. Despite this, the street has retained a spacious and open sense, and is punctuated by generous gaps between the pairs of semis which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. Whilst the proposed extension would be set in from the shared boundary, back from the frontage and down from the ridge height of the host dwelling, it would be marginal at best. The effect of this would be to fill a substantial proportion of the open gap between the appeal building and the non-adjoined neighbour, noticeably eroding the spacious character of the street scene. I note that the existing garage sits close to the aforementioned shared boundary and the two-storey extension would not be dissimilar in this regard. But, as a two-storey extension, it would be much taller and thereby considerably less subtle in its overall effect.
5. The adjoining neighbour has a first-floor extension above the garage. However, this has a generous set back from the front elevation of the host property. The

positioning significantly further forward of the appeal scheme would add significant mass to one side, greatly unbalancing the pair's symmetry and thus have a fundamentally different effect.

6. Whether or not the appeal proposal may have had a different outcome prior to the adoption of the existing development plan, I must make my decision against the current policy position. In this regard, I note the reference to other extensions to properties near the appeal site. I observed these on my site visit. I have limited information before me, such as evidence of their planning history. Thus, I am unsure as to the circumstances of their approval. Even so, the existence of other extensions has not fundamentally altered the character and appearance of the area to the extent that the proposed development would be acceptable.
7. With the above in mind, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. Consequently, it would fail to comply with the requirements of Policy CP10 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy 2013. This policy seeks to ensure, among other things, that design respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the borough and its locality. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice contained within the Council's House Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2019 which sets out, amongst other things, acceptable locations, sizes and projections for extensions to dwellings having regard to the character and appearance of the dwelling to which they would be attached and the wider street scene.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

C McDonagh

INSPECTOR