



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2024

by **R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/24/3354286

59 Stout Street, Leigh, Wigan WN7 4QR

- 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 Mrs Sharon Hendrie against the decision of Wigan Council.
 - The application Ref is A/24/96845/HH.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and single storey rear extensions with widening of driveway to provide one additional parking space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The Council have raised no issue in respect of the proposed single storey rear extension. The main issues in this case are therefore the effect of the proposed side extension on the living conditions of the neighbours at 57 Stout Street, and the effect of the proposed parking arrangement on highway safety.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. No.59 Stout Street (No.59) is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling, orientated so that the principal (front) elevation faces the corner of Stout Street and Weaver Grove. Because of its corner location, No.59 has a good sized side garden accommodating a garden shed and single car parking space with dropped kerb access to the highway.
4. A two-storey extension is proposed which would be set well back from the front elevation of No.59, projecting a maximum width of around 3.5m into the side garden. The adjacent semi-detached pair of dwellings (at No.55 and No.57 Stout Street) front the corner of Stout Street and Trent Grove and are sited broadly at a 45 degree angle, such that No.57 Stout Street (No.57) shares a common rear boundary with No.59 and has a close physical relationship with it.
5. Due to the shape of the site, the two-storey extension has been designed so that the corner is splayed running parallel to the boundary. At the rear corner, I accept that the proposed extension would project only 1.35m closer to the shared boundary with No.57. However, I observed on my site visit that the rear garden of No.57 is small and 'hemmed-in' and the main patio area is located between the dwelling's conservatory and the shared boundary. The proposed two-storey side

extension would be offset only 0.6m from this boundary and its eaves height would be around 4.9m. Although the roof would slope away from No.57, the increased massing of the flank elevation of No.59 would nonetheless be dominant. I find it would result in further sense of hemmed in enclosure to the rear of No.59, but also to the side as the proposed extension returns along the boundary. This overbearing impact on the patio area (to both the rear and side) would be to the detriment of the neighbours enjoyment of the garden.

6. I therefore conclude on the first main issue that the proposed two-storey extension would cause significant harm to the living conditions of the neighbours at No.57, with regard a loss of outlook. Consequently, it would conflict with the guidance at paragraph 2.2 of the Council's *House Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2019)* (SPD) that any proposed householder development should not be dominant or overbearing to neighbouring properties. It would further conflict with policies CP10 and CP17 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2013) (CS) and Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024) which together require new development to integrate with its surroundings, is designed so that it does not have an adverse impact on amenity and quality of life, and provides comfortable and inviting outdoor environments.

Highway Safety

7. To the side of No.59 is a single car parking space with a dropped kerb to Stout Street. I note that the original application submission proposed 2no. car parking spaces sited to the side and front of the proposed two-storey side extension.
8. The guidance in the Council's *Policy Note: Car Parking Standards for New Development (2023)* (PN) is that for four bedrooms houses, three car parking spaces should normally be provided, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that a lower level of provision will not given rise to on-street parking within or in the vicinity of the development. The proposed Site Plan was amended to accord with this PN and shows an additional car parking space to the front of No.59.
9. I accept that car parking spaces 2 and 3 would overhang/overrun the pedestrian path to the front door of No.59 and that vehicles would need to be parked very close to the dwelling to prevent overhanging of the footway to the front. It is also acknowledged that a vehicle in car parking space 2 would need to move off the drive to allow a vehicle using car parking space 3 to exit. However, this type of arrangement is not uncommon and would be managed by the occupiers of the dwelling. I observed on my site visit that Stout Street is a quiet residential street and therefore I do not find that such manoeuvring vehicles on and off the driveway would be detrimental to highway safety.
10. I also share the appellant's view that the PN is designed for new houses, rather than an extension to an existing dwelling. The guidance in the Council's *House Extension Design Guide Supplementary Document (2019)* is more applicable, which, in dealing explicitly with side extensions at paragraph 3.21, requires one parking space for houses with up to 3 bedrooms and two parking spaces for houses with 4 or more bedrooms.
11. I therefore conclude on the second main issue that the proposed car parking arrangement would not be detrimental to highway safety. It would not conflict with

CS Policy CP7, saved Policy A1S of the Wigan Unitary Development Plan (2006) and PfE Policy JP-C8 which all seek to ensure provision of appropriate and safe parking.

Conclusion

12. Notwithstanding my conclusion in respect of the parking arrangement, I have concluded that the proposed two-storey side extension would cause significant harm to the living conditions of the neighbours at No.57 Stout Street. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR