



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2024

by D Hartley BA (Hons) MTP MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/24/3340749

12 Manor Grove, Aspull, Wigan, Lancashire, WN2 1SA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Robert Litherland against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is A/24/96636/HH.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal constitutes good design and its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached, two-storey, brick built dwellinghouse falling within a cul-de-sac of other semi-detached dwellinghouses. There are six semi-detached properties in total which overlook Crawford's Wood.
4. The appeal property is at the end of Manor Grove, which is a no through route for vehicular traffic, but where there is a footpath leading to surrounding land. The three pairs of semi-detached properties are essentially unaltered. They all share the same design characteristics, and there is a pleasing consistency to the space between the properties. Overall, there is a design cohesion across the three blocks of semi-detached houses. The design balance and symmetry of the semi-detached properties adds positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the street when experienced by users of Manor Grove and the adjacent footpaths.
5. It is proposed to erect a two-storey side extension which would project about 5.9 metres from the existing side elevation of the host property. It would be set back from the front elevation of the dwellinghouse by about 0.60 of a metre and would project forward of the main rear elevation by approximately 0.36 of a metre. The ridge line of the proposed pitched roof of the extension would be set down marginally from that of the existing property.
6. Owing to the excessive width of the side extension, coupled with the fact that neither its roof nor its front wall would be suitably set down or back from the existing roof or front wall of the dwellinghouse, I find that it would have the

effect of unacceptably harming the design balance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellinghouses.

7. While I acknowledge that the property is positioned at the end of the cul-de-sac, it would nevertheless be conspicuous in view for those that use the adjacent footpaths. From these areas, the extension would have a dominant and incongruous appearance and would fail to be appreciated as a subordinate and sympathetic addition. The extension would be of a scale and appearance that would lead to a harmful terracing impact, departing unacceptably from the pleasing rhythm of semi-detached dwellinghouses that exist in this street.
8. The appellant has referred me to examples of two other semi-detached dwellinghouses in the area which have been extended. I do not know the circumstances which led to these properties being extended, but, in any event, I do not find that they are proportionate or subordinate in scale. Furthermore, I have determined this appeal considering the distinctive and positive characteristics of Manor Grove. In this context, I have determined the appeal on its individual planning merits. Therefore, the examples of other house extensions elsewhere do not alter or outweigh my conclusion on the main issue.
9. For the above reasons, I find that the development would not constitute good design and significant harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would not therefore accord with the design, character, and appearance requirements of policy CP10 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy 2013, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document 2022-2039, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document for House Extensions 2019, and chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024.

Conclusion

10. I conclude that the development would not accord with the development plan for the area taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

D Hartley

INSPECTOR