



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2024

by **Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6TH February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/24/3353461

561 Wigan Road, Ashton in Makerfield, Wigan WN4 0BX

- 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 Philip Taylor against the decision of Wigan Council.
 - The application Ref is A/24/97522/HH.
 - The development proposed is dormer extension to the side and rear elevations, creating a 2nd floor, containing a bathroom and bedroom.
-

Decision

The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

1. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the street scene.

Reasons

2. The appeal building is a two storey dwelling located at the end of a terrace which has terraced buildings at either side. The terraces are characterised in their form and design by their end buildings having gables at their front elevations. There is a track to the rear of the terraces with access from Soughers Lane. This part of Wigan Road has terraced rows of dwellings at either side. Residential development in the wider locality varies in age, form, and design.
3. The proposed side dormer would involve removal of a chimney stack. It would join with the proposed second floor rear extension. It would have a very shallow roof slope and box-like in design. The rear elevations of the terraced houses including the appeal building are primarily seen from the rear track. They have various outriggers and alterations. The proposed rear extension would be an uncharacteristic design feature because of its almost flat roof.
4. There is only approximately a one metre gap between the side elevation of 561 and the neighbouring dwelling in the next terrace, restricting public views of that side elevation. However, the side elevation of the proposed dormer would be seen in direct views of 561 from Wigan Road as it would project sideways from the main roof. The proposed dormer extension would therefore appear prominent and out of character in the streetscene. Despite the similarity of its height, it would harm the roof form of the building by destroying its symmetry and that of the terrace as a whole as seen from Wigan Road because of the unaltered gable end roof forms that exist. In this respect the proposed dormer

would conflict with advice in the Council's House Extension Design Guide supplementary planning document which advises that a dormer extension should not have a detrimental impact on the balance of a building.

5. I find that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the building and the street scene. It would conflict with Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy policy CP10 which seeks to ensure that proposals respect and acknowledge the character and identity of the borough and integrate effectively with their surroundings. It would fail to conform with policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan regarding sustainable places. It would also conflict with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

6. The appellant has referred to the existence of other dormers of different styles, and changes to houses in the area, including a dormer at 550 Wigan Road almost opposite his property. The circumstances of that dormer differ from those at the appeal building because it is located at the rear roof slope and does not affect the front elevation. The appellant has indicated that the building works are required as the existing roof is in an unrepairable condition. However, there would be other ways of providing repairs rather than through the appeal proposals. I also acknowledge that no objections to the proposed development have been raised by neighbours.
7. However, these considerations are insufficient to outweigh my finding that the proposed development would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and the street scene. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole.

Conclusion

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

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR