



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2021

by C Rafferty LLB (Hons), Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/21/3275188

24 Bolney Street, Aspull WN2 1EQ

- 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 Rosalind Flavell against the decision of Wigan Council.
 - The application Ref A/21/90910/HH, dated 12 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. While the appellant has stated that the Council's Officer Report does not present any issues with regards to the rear extension element of the proposal, the Decision Notice has refused the proposal as a whole in respect of the main issue. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on this basis.
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. Any comments received have been taken into account in this decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal building is one half of a pair of semi detached two storey dwellings. It is a corner plot, stood off its side boundary where it abuts a walkway and an area of open space. It is therefore prominent in the public realm. The spacing to the side of the appeal building, along with the siting of No 5b Kirkless Street with which it shares a consistent building line and the set back of Nos 68 to 73 Bolney Street, gives the immediate area around the walkway a strong sense of spaciousness that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposed side and rear extensions, whilst incorporating some subservient elements and materials and roof styles to match the host dwelling, would be

built up to the side boundary adjacent the walkway. Not only would this present a largely blank, featureless and high sided masonry wall to the walkway, but it would noticeably and significantly reduce the spaciousness of the area. Accordingly it would cause harm to its character and appearance. This would result in conflict with Policies CP10 and CP17 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document September 2013, the Wigan Council House Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD) and the provisions of the Framework, which together seek to promote good design.

Other Matters

7. In some respects, such as the use of matching materials, design subservience and complementary roof shapes, the proposal would comply with the SPD. I also note that the SPD does not specifically reference dwellings situated alongside walkways. However, it does recognise the visual prominence of corner plots and advises that if extensions on these plots encroach beyond the main building lines on either street, they may have an adverse effect on the character of the area.
8. Other two storey side extensions are present on Bolney Street, including at the neighbouring attached dwelling and Nos. 20 and 22. While these were approved prior to the SPD, the guidance in place at the time was largely similar. Nonetheless, the appeal site is distinguished by its corner plot and adjacent walkway, where the impact of the proposal on the spaciousness of the area would cause harm. Although the addition at No. 22 is also built up to the side boundary, this is not a defining characteristic of the area. The appeal must be assessed on its own site specific circumstances and merits.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, the proposal would not accord with the development plan. There are no relevant material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

C Rafferty

INSPECTOR