



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/21/3282987

74 Lincoln Drive, Ashton-In-Makerfield, Wigan, WN4 9HU

- 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 Mark Duffy against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref A/21/91479/HH, dated 29 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey 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 area.

Reasons

3. No 74 is a 2 storey semi-detached dwelling in a row of matching properties in a residential area. Elsewhere, the prevailing style is similarly sized single storey semi-detached properties with large dormer extensions to front and rear roof slopes. Properties are set back from the road on similar building lines behind open frontages with low boundary walls. Pairs of properties are evenly spaced and separated from one another by driveways.
4. The House Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document Adopted June 2019 (the SPD) seeks to ensure that extensions are subservient and that they respect the pattern of buildings and spaces. Where spaces between buildings contribute to the street scene, such as here, proposals are expected to maintain spaces to avoid the creation of an uncharacteristic terraced built form. In order to guide acceptable forms of extension, the SPD provides specific guidance in relation to separation distances and set backs.
5. In this case, the proposed 2 storey side extension would finish approximately 150mm from the shared side boundary. It would be flush with the main front elevation at ground floor level and it would be set back by 1m at first floor level. The extension would have an eaves height to match its host, and its roof would be set only slightly below the main roof ridge line. The separation and set back would not be in accordance with the guidance in the SPD.
6. The extension would be overly wide in its plot and it would not respect the characteristic spacing of properties in the area. The limited reduction in the

first floor depth and roof height, compared to its host, would not be sufficient to prevent a terracing effect if the neighbouring property was to be similarly extended to the side. The significant narrowing of the gap between properties, combined with the limited articulation, would create nearly continuous built form. The resulting terracing effect would be detrimental and it would not make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness or sense of place.

7. Furthermore, the lack of set back at ground floor level and the absence of pedestrian access to the rear of the property would mean that refuse and recycling bins would need to be stored forward of the front elevation of the appeal property. The prominent siting of waste facilities would be further detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene.
8. Therefore, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with LP Policy CP10 which requires, among other things, that proposals respect the character and identity of the area including in terms of siting, size and scale, and that they meet established standards for design. The proposal would conflict with the aims of the SPD. It would also conflict with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to adding to the overall quality of the area, being visually attractive and sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

9. Following the refusal of the planning application, an amended scheme was submitted and it was approved. Although not the appellant's preferred option, it would be the fallback position if the appeal should fail. The approved extension differs from the proposal in that it would be set back at both ground and first floor levels. It would be a similar width and height to the proposal, but the 2 storey set back would reduce its visual prominence. The neighbouring property could be extended to the side without the creation of a harmful terracing effect. It would allow for the storage of bins behind the main elevation building line. As it would be a less harmful form of development, the fallback position does not provide a justification for the proposal.
10. Two storey side extensions have been granted permission elsewhere in the area. Although full details have not been provided, they appear to differ from the proposal. Most relate to single storey dormer dwellings. While they finish close to the side boundary, they appear to be set back at both ground and first floor levels. With a single exception, they were approved in an earlier policy context prior to the adoption of the SPD. As they do not appear directly comparable, they do not provide a justification for the proposal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR