
Appeal Decision



The Planning Inspectorate

Site visit made on 15 October 2024

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/24/3346152

2 Harlech Avenue, Hindley Green, Wigan, WN2 4RA

- 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 Chris Peszel against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is A/23/96465/HH.
 - The development proposed is a side and rear single storey extension, with loft conversion with velux lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant has submitted amended plans with the appeal. However, I must determine the appeal based on the plans which were refused by the Council. To do otherwise could be prejudicial to the Council and any interested third parties who would otherwise not have been consulted.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the street scene, and the effect on highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal building is a semi-detached bungalow located in a corner position at the junction of Harlech Avenue with Ludlow Avenue. It has a front single storey gabled projection, which is a common feature of bungalows in the vicinity. The form of the existing projection matches the size and scale of a similar projection at its adjoining paired bungalow, which has a front roof dormer.
5. The proposed front elevation would have a large gabled projection which would have the same height as the main ridge line of the building. It would be around three metres wider than the existing gabled projection that it would replace. There would be a significant increase in the length and bulk of the bungalow when viewed from Ludlow Avenue.

6. The proposed front gabled projection would significantly disrupt the general symmetry of the front elevation of the pair of semi-detached bungalows because of its height, scale and massing. The form and scale of the proposed development would not be subordinate to the existing building and out of character with the majority of bungalows in the surrounding area, contrary to advice in the Council's Householder Design Guide supplementary planning document (SPD). Moreover, in view of its corner position, the proposed development would result in a building that would be unduly prominent and discordant in the street scene.
7. The appellant has referred to other extensions in Ludlow Avenue, including a large corner extension at 45 Ludlow Avenue. However, the development at 45 Ludlow Avenue was granted permission in 2014, prior to publication of the Council's House Extensions Design Guide SPD in 2019. Its site circumstances differ to those of the appeal building as it is located near to the open space of Clayhole Park.
8. The front gable of the example cited at 43 Ludlow Avenue has a ridge line below that of the main roof. Neither of these examples form sufficient precedence to allow harmful development at the appeal site.
9. I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the building and the street scene. It would conflict with Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy policy CP10 which requires new development to respect and acknowledge the character and identity of the Borough and its locality in terms of siting, size, scale and details used.

Highway safety

10. The Council's Policy Parking Note requires the provision of three parking spaces for a four bedroom property. Only one space is shown on the refused drawing, with no manoeuvring space. Any additional family vehicles or visitor vehicles would therefore have to park on the highway, thereby reducing the free flow of traffic. Vehicles would either have to reverse into or out of the space. In view of the proximity of the road junction this could lead to potential conflict with other vehicles using this part of the highway network.
11. I find that the proposal would be detrimental to highway safety. It would be contrary to the Parking Policy Note and Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy policy CP7 which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure the provision of appropriate and safe parking as part of new development.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has indicated that the proposal would incorporate solar and air source heat pump systems to minimise the impact of climate change in accordance with criterion 4 of Core Strategy policy CP10.
13. It is also submitted that the proposal would be preferable to adding dormer roof extensions under permitted development rights, although no drawings for potential dormers have been provided. There was also a letter of support from a neighbour.
14. However, these considerations are insufficient reason to outweigh my findings that the proposal would have a significant harmful effect on the character and

appearance of the building and the street scene, would be detrimental to highway safety, and would conflict with the development plan as a whole.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR