



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2024

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/24/3344660

86 Gilda Road, Worsley M28 1BP

- 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 Mr Lombardo against the decision of Wigan Council.
 - The application Ref is A/24/96599/HH.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing single storey garage and erection of two storey and single storey side extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council have raised no issue in respect of the single storey side extension. Therefore, the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed two-storey side extension and Juliet balcony on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No.86 Gilda Road (No.86) is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the north side of Gilda Road. To the side, No.86 has an attached single-storey garage, with shallow mono-pitched roof, which projects up to the boundary with the non-attached neighbour at No.84 Gilda Road (No.84). It is proposed to demolish this existing garage and construct a two-storey extension to the side and a single storey extension to part side and rear.
4. The guidance for side extensions and alterations in the *House Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2019)* (SPD) is that the Council will seek to prevent the loss of space between buildings where the spaces are important in defining the character of the streetscene, and where their loss would give the impression of a continuous built form. To avoid a 'terrace effect,' a side extension should be stepped in from the boundary by 800mm.
5. The northern side of this section of Gilda Road (up to the junction with Thornton Road) is characterised by pairs of two-storey semi-detached dwellings with a simple hipped roof form and fenestration details. I acknowledge that neighbouring dwellings in this section have been extended to the side over two-storeys, but I observed that a reasonable gap has nonetheless been retained between each of the semi-detached pairs contributing to a spacious

- character and appearance. There are no examples where non-attached neighbours have both been extended up to their respective boundaries.
6. The proposed two-storey side extension has been offset (at both ground and first floor) by around 1m from the principal front elevation, so at ground floor aligning with the existing attached garage. I note that this is consistent with the SPD guidance that, to avoid the appearance of terracing, both ground and first floor should be set back by this amount. However, the proposed side extension would project around 2.7m from the existing two-storey flank elevation of No.86, offset only around 250mm from its shared boundary with No.84.
 7. I observed that looking east there is currently a visible space between the built form of No.86 and its non-attached neighbour at No.84. This is despite a slightly staggered building line, No.84 being set at a higher level, and benefitting from a two-storey side extension, which itself projects up to the shared boundary. Notwithstanding the 1m set back, because of its very minimal offset from the shared boundary, the first floor of the proposed side extension to No.86 would fill this space giving the appearance of a continuous built form. Similarly, from the west, a garage and porch which project forward of the principal elevation of No.84, would largely obscure the ground floor of the proposed extension, but the first floor would very noticeably fill the space between the two semi-detached pairs. This I find would be to the detriment of the spacious character and appearance of the streetscene I have described above.
 8. My attention has been drawn, in the appellant's evidence, to Figure 14 of the SPD, and I acknowledge that there are similarities between the appeal proposals and the right hand image (noted as acceptable), in terms of the offset from both the principal elevation and ridgeline. However, both two-storey extensions (to No.86 and No.84; the latter pre-dating the SPD guidance), would be set right on the shared boundary, with only around 250mm between them. It would therefore be most comparable to the (unacceptable) left hand image, despite the differing roof profile, which results in the terracing effect the SPD seeks to avoid.
 9. The Council's SPD guidance is that, when introducing new window openings or doors, careful attention must be given to the sizes, proportions and styles and, in general, should be the same or complementary to the existing. As described above, I observed that dwellings to the north side of this section of Gilda Road have simple fenestration details and there is a consistent and uniform lower cill line for first floor windows, even where dwellings have been extended.
 10. At first floor, above the proposed integral garage, full height glazed doors are proposed with a 1100mm high toughened glass balustrade (Juliet balcony) and a cill level much lower than the cills of the existing first floor windows. Whilst I accept that a Juliet balcony is not necessarily an alien feature in a residential area, and would be set back from the principal elevation (on the proposed side extension), in this case, it would be an unsympathetic addition to its host given the uniformity of fenestration, appearing incongruous in the wider streetscene.
 11. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposals would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. In addition to the conflict with the SPD guidance identified, they would conflict with Policy CP10 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy (2013) which requires

new development to respect and acknowledge the character of the locality, in terms of the siting, size and scale used, and meets established standards for design. It would further conflict with the principles of good design set out in Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

12. The Appeal Statement advises that the appellant would be accepting of a split decision should I be minded to allow some but not all elements of the appeal. As set out above, the Council have raised no issue in respect of the single storey rear/side extension and I have no reason to form a different view. Whilst I have given careful consideration to the potential for a split decision, it is not clear from the information before me, including the application plans, whether the two-storey side extension and single storey side extension are physically severable; the flat roof of the latter being linked to the former. I have not therefore issued a split decision in this instance.

Conclusion

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

R. Jones

INSPECTOR