

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 19 July 2021 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/21/3273655

4 Toulston Road, Wigan, WN6 7EX

- 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 Adam Walls against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref A/21/90728/HH, dated 22 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is 2 storey side and rear extension, hip to gable roof conversion with rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Accordingly, and in light of the reference made to the previous iteration of the Framework within the submitted evidence, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. The comments which have been received have been taken into consideration within the appeal decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The host dwelling is a two-storey detached house, sitting within a prominent location at the entrance to a modern estate. It has a detached garage to the side, set back from the dwelling's rear elevation. 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.

6. The design of the 2 storey side extension whilst being subservient in scale to the host dwelling would not be in keeping with the design of the host dwelling, introducing an uncharacteristic roof design and eaves height and proportion of brick wall which would result in an alien form of development which would, as a result of its proximity to the road be intrusive and prominent in the streetscene.
7. The additional massing that would occur as a result of the hip-to-gable conversion would unbalance the appearance of the dwelling and its relationship with its similarly designed neighbours to either side, as would the incongruous boxy rear dormer window. The proposed development would lead to the host dwelling being incongruous within its surroundings and would erode the contribution that the property makes to the character and appearance of the area.
8. Photographs have been provided that show extensions elsewhere in the area. From my visit I saw that there have been several extensions in the vicinity of the appeal site, and whilst some were closer to the highway, the roofs retained the hipped feature which reduced the dominance in the street scene. However, the specific details of these cases are not before this appeal and I therefore am uncertain of the planning policy context in which planning permission was granted. In any event, I have determined this appeal on the site-specific circumstances of this case.
9. Given the above I conclude that the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, in conflict with Policies CP10 and CP17 of the Wigan Council Local Plan Core Strategy (2013) which together seek to ensure that development integrates with its surroundings and respects local character in terms of scale. It would also conflict with the House Extension Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2019) in terms of roof extensions respecting the host property and with the good design and character aims of the Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR