



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 21 July 2021

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/21/3273893

22 Landside, Leigh WN7 3JT

- 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 & Mrs Stuart Lea against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref A/21/90817/HH, dated 25 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is the enlargement of existing front dormers, new pitched roof over existing rear flat roof, new side canopy together with internal and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the appeal was submitted, the revised National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) came into force on 20 July 2021. I have taken this into consideration in determining this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a semi-detached bungalow which is situated in a predominantly residential area. The area in the vicinity of the site contains a range of bungalows, which are situated on consistent building lines. They are set back behind low front boundary walls, that afford views of front garden and parking areas. This arrangement contributes to the harmonious and spacious characteristics of the area.
5. The proposal would result in the two front individual dormers being replaced with a single larger dormer. Although it would incorporate two pitched roof elements as part of its design, and in this regard, accord with guidance set out in the House Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD), the SPD also requires dormers to fit comfortably within the roof of the building. The scale of the dormer proposed, which would extend across most of the width of the roof and only feature a small set down from the ridge, would dominate the roofscape and relate poorly to the existing bungalow.

6. The adjoining bungalow does not have a dormer, but both it and the appeal site appear as modest bungalows. The increase in the size of the dormer would unduly imbalance this pair of properties in conflict with guidance in paragraph 3.44 of the SPD.
7. Reference has been made to other properties in the area which have dormers. From my site observations, and as acknowledged by the appellants, most of the properties on this side of the street where the appeal site is situated do not have front dormers. Whilst I was able to see some instances of larger dormers, including those on the eastern side of the street, it was clear that they were in the minority. The majority of dormers in the area are small with large areas of roof slope around them. In contrast, the proposal would, due to its scale, dominate the roof of the host property and result in it having an incongruous appearance in the area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy CP 10 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy (2013), which requires, amongst other matters, new development that respects and acknowledges the character of the borough and its locality in terms of siting, size and scale. It would also be contrary to the SPD and Paragraph 130 of the recently revised Framework, which seek, amongst other matters, development that is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

9. I accept that the proposal would provide additional accommodation to meet family needs. However, these personal circumstances are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.
10. I note that the appellants have stated that they have the support from neighbouring occupiers and the development would provide structural and environmental improvements. These matters do not however justify permitting a development that would be contrary to the development plan. I agree with the appellants that there should be consistency in decision-making, but from the limited information before me on the circumstances of other cases, there is nothing to demonstrate that they are so similar to this appeal development that they provide clear precedents.
11. The appellants have set out factual inaccuracies in the Planning Officer's Report and the manner in which the appeal application, which was amended from an earlier application, were considered by the Council. However, those are matters of practical administration of the application rather than to the planning merits of the scheme. As such, I can confirm that I have determined the appeal before me on its own merits.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR