



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2025

by **Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/24/3355995

7 Cornelian Grove, Ashton-in-Makerfield, Wigan, WN4 9RW

- 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 Sean Rudd against the decision of Wigan Council
 - The application Ref is A/24/97548/HH.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed development on:-
 - the character and appearance of the street scene;
 - highway safety in regard to parking provision.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a small modern semi-detached house on a short, narrow and winding cul-de-sac of mainly semi-detached and terraced dwellings. Although the road is located at the far end of Ellesmere Road and is not prominent within the wider locality, the spaces between each building make an important contribution to the character and appearance of the immediate locality by providing some openness that prevents the street scene from feeling too built-up or enclosed.
4. The proposed two storey side extension would be sited only 150mm from the side boundary with the neighbouring property and this would be contrary to the Council's House Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD, 2019) which requires a gap of 800mm to avoid a 'terracing effect' and ensure access for bins storage away from the street frontage. I have noted that the proposal meets the SPD requirement of a 1m set back from the front elevation and that other local authorities consider that this alone is sufficient. However, if the neighbouring dwelling were to extend in a similar manner there would be a loss of the gap between the buildings and a continuous block of four dwellings, albeit with a set back and lower ridge height.

5. I have considered the other examples referred to by the appellant within and outside the district but the character of most of those examples differs significantly from here. Elway Road, Langdale Grove, Lester Drive and Broadway are straight, linear and wider roads that differ from the narrower, winding nature of Cornelian Grove; Recreation Avenue, Langdale Grove, Lester Drive and Broadway comprise traditional semi-detached houses with hipped roofs unlike the modern, pitched roof dwelling here; in those examples there is therefore a greater sense of space in the street scene. I have insufficient details of the planning status of the extension nearby at Medlar Way and cannot be certain that this was allowed after the adoption of the Council's SPD and in the same policy context. Those examples, therefore, are not directly compatible and do not provide justification for this proposal.
6. I conclude then that, by reason of its proximity to the side boundary, the proposed side extension would result in a substantial reduction of the gap between the dwelling and its neighbour which would cause a loss of openness and significant harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to development plan policies CP10 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy (CS, 2013) and JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (2024) that together seek to ensure that new development respects the character of the locality and meets established standards for design.

Highway safety

7. The proposal includes an additional, fourth bedroom. The Council's Parking Policy Note (PPN, 2023) requires additional parking spaces beyond the maximum set out in saved policy A1S of the Wigan Unitary Development Plan (UDP, 2006), resulting in a normal requirement of three, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that a lower level of provision will not give rise to on-street parking within or in the vicinity of the development.
8. The appeal site includes an existing garage that is sited at the end of the rear garden and accessed from the drive to the side of the dwelling, extending alongside the rear lawn. The existing layout provides two parking spaces on the drive at the side of the house.
9. Although the plans show that the proposal would provide three parking spaces (two within and to the front of the car port and one within the garage), those are not to the standard sought in the PPN. Both of the spaces within and to the front of the carport are between 0.9m and 1.05m short of the PPN's required width of 3.6m and that the space to the front is also short of the 6m length required in the PPN and the House Extensions SPD referred to in paragraph 4.
10. I noted at my visit that there is no boundary between the drive and the rear lawn and agree with the Council's view that the use of the existing garage for parking would lead to a substantial reversing distance and a danger to pedestrian safety. I also agree with the Council that the space within the garage cannot be guaranteed to provide parking rather than storage. The proposed third garage space is, therefore, unacceptable.
11. The difficulty in accessing the garage and the restricted width and length of the two car port spaces would require extra effort and time to use than the use of the existing drive. It seems likely then that this would sometimes discourage drivers

from parking in those spaces and this would lead to additional on-street parking. At my visit I saw that although most of the houses have off-street parking, there were a number of cars parked around the cul-de-sac, most parked partly on the footway. Given the winding nature and narrow width of the cul-de-sac, together with the number of vehicular accesses, the availability of safe on-street parking is extremely limited here. Although there may be many other dwellings in the area with similar parking arrangements, any increase in on-street parking in this particular location would therefore lead to an unacceptable danger to pedestrians and other road users who would be unable to have a sufficient view of cars manoeuvring in and out of parking positions.

12. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would result in significant harm to highway safety, contrary to development plan policy CP7 in the CS that seeks to ensure the provision of appropriate, well designed, convenient, safe and secure parking provision.

Other matters and conclusion

13. Whilst the proposal would provide additional bedroom space for the appellant's growing family, that is a modest private benefit that would not outweigh the significant harm to the wider public that would be caused in terms of the two main issues.
14. I have noted that the Council has raised no objection to the single storey rear extension and have no reason to disagree but as this is not clearly severable from the side extension I am unable to issue a split decision to allow that part of the development.
15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR