

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2024

by John Whalley

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th March 2024

Appeal ref: APP/V4250/D/24/3336639

29 Woodhurst Drive, Standish, Greater Manchester WN6 0RW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Chris Hurst and Mrs Kathryn Hurst against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application, ref. A/23/96322/HH, dated 23 October 2023, was refused by a notice dated 18 December 2023.
 - The development is: Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension, canopy to front and associated external alterations including replacement windows and new entrance to front following demolition of existing conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The decision turns on the likely effect of the proposed extension works to the house at No. 29 on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its immediate surroundings.

Appeal dwelling and proposed works

3. The appeal concerns a proposal to extend the detached 2 storey house at No. 29 Woodhurst Drive. The house stands in a rather prominent spot at the junction with Langham Road. The open Woodhurst Drive Park is on the opposite side of Langham Road. The almost 3.5m wide 2 storey extension would be built on to the south western gable wall together with a 3.05m deep single storey rear extension built to the full width of the extended house.

Considerations

4. The Council said the proposed extensions would be dominant additions to the host dwelling. They would have an adverse impact upon the dwelling's character, with a significantly increase of the dwelling's prominence in the street scene. In their view that would adversely affect the open character of the area, contrary to Policy CP10 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy and the design objectives of the Supplementary Planning Document for House Extensions.
5. The Council's SPD House Extensions Design Guide (2019) says an extension should be subordinate to the existing and neighbouring buildings and in character with the surrounding area, (para. 2.5). A house extension should be

positioned so it does not dominate the street scene. It should complement the existing dwelling and respect neighbouring properties. The guidance says consideration should be given to the design and siting of either a single storey or two storey extension on a corner plot due to its visual prominence in the built environment. Blank gables will not generally be acceptable. A corner plot extension must not encroach beyond established building lines on either street as it may have an adverse impact on the character of the local area.

6. I agree with the Council that the extensive additions to the house as proposed at No. 29 would be on a scale that would produce a materially detrimental effect on the immediate street scene, failing in significant detail to comply with Council guidance on house extensions. I can understand the desire to extend the house, the sizeable gap to the side of the house to Langham Road suggesting a suitable opportunity. Building the 3.48m extra width towards Langham Road would add another small room width to the house. However, the 2 storey side extension would retain only about a 1m space to Langham Road. The over 40% width increase would be a substantially proportionate increase, to a sympathetic design, but which would not be set back nor would have a lower ridge than that of the existing house. That would be a variance to the Design Guide which says the form and scale of an extension should be subordinate to the existing and neighbouring buildings and in character with the surrounding area.
7. Particularly as the 2 storey side extension would not be a subordinate to the existing house at No. 29, there would be an undue increase of its prominence in the immediate street scene, further contrasting with the open nature of the park land opposite. That would be exacerbated somewhat by the undesirable large blank south-western facing side wall of the extended house.
8. The single storey rear extension is less contentious. However, whilst replacing a substantial glazed conservatory, the large flat roofed rear extension would be built to the full width of the extended house to a height of over 3m. As the Council said, it would be amply visible at and close to the junction of Woodhurst Drive and Langham Road, occupying a large part of the No. 29 plot. The large single storey extension would add to the excess of the more prominent 2 storey extension project, adding to its unjustified prominence in the street scene.

Conclusion

9. I conclude that the appeal should fail.

John Whalley

INSPECTOR