



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2021

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MIEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/21/3279387

32 Meynell Drive, Leigh, Wigan WN7 3JR

- 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 Lewis against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref A/21/91061/HH, dated 3 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and one storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side extension and one storey rear extension at 32 Meynell Drive, Leigh, Wigan WN7 3JR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref A/21/91061/HH, dated 3 March 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, 25/01/2021; Existing & Proposed Plans and Elevations, ref 2142_LEI_01 Planning.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No 32 is a 2 storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey flat roof garage separated from its side elevation by a covered walkway. It occupies an irregularly shaped corner plot on a residential street characterised by similar properties albeit interspersed with a small number of properties of different styles and sizes. Properties are consistently set back and separated from the footway by low brick walls. The repeating dwelling styles and materials and open frontage treatments result in a harmonious character and appearance.
4. The proposed rear extension would be set slightly in from the boundary with No 30 and it would finish partway along the rear elevation of the proposed side extension. On the basis of the information before me, including its size, design

and siting and its relationship to neighbouring properties, I find that the rear extension would not result in harm or conflict with the development plan.

5. The side extension would be just under 4m wide, set in slightly from the side boundary. It would be the full height of its host and it would have a hipped roof to match. It would be the full length of the side elevation of No 32 and it would be flush with the front elevation. As it would not therefore be subservient to its host, the side extension would not be in accordance with the guidance in the Council's House Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document Adopted June 2019 (the SPD). However, the guidance is intended to ensure that side extensions avoid a terracing effect in conjunction with neighbouring properties on similar building lines. In this case, No 32 is on a sharp bend in the road and it sits at right angles to No 34 with its side elevation behind the rear building line of the neighbouring property. Consequently, irrespective of its size and scale, the proposal would not result in a terracing effect.
6. While it would be a larger dwelling, the design and materials of the proposal would respect the front elevation and the hipped roof form. The proposal would be well related to its host and it would not overwhelm it. It would not be forward of the front building line of the host property or neighbouring properties such that it would not be a prominent feature. By virtue of being at the end of the row on a corner plot, with dissimilar properties on the opposite side of the road, the proposal would not disrupt a uniform group of matching properties. Furthermore, having viewed the similar 2 storey side extension to No 34, I am satisfied that the proposal would not be visually obtrusive nor discordant in the street scene.
7. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the appeal property or the area. It would not conflict with Policy CP10 of the Wigan Council Local Plan Core Strategy Adopted September 2013 which requires, among other things, that proposal respect the character of the area and integrate with their surroundings. It would not conflict with the aims of the SPD. As it would be sympathetic to the surrounding built environment and it would contribute to sense of place, the proposal would not conflict with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Conditions

8. The Council has suggested planning conditions in the event the appeal was allowed. I have considered these against the relevant requirements of the Framework. In addition to the standard condition limiting the lifespan of the planning permission, I have specified the approved plans in the interests of certainty. A condition securing matching materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted, subject to conditions.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR