



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/24/3355288

24 Lichfield Avenue, Tyldesley, Wigan, M29 7WW

- 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 and Mrs C Osborne against the decision of Wigan Council
 - The application Ref is A/24/97379/HH.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of single storey side and rear extension at 24 Lichfield Avenue, Tyldesley, Wigan, M29 7WW in accordance with the application Ref A/24/97379/HH, subject to the following conditions:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 001 REV A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site occupies a wide plot and is the last property on the eastern side of Lichfield Avenue, located at the head of this cul-de-sac of modern, modestly sized semi-detached houses. The front gardens of the dwellings together with a continuous line of trees and shrubs at the head of the cu-de-sac contribute positively to its suburban character. The houses are sited on a staggered building line and the appeal dwelling and its neighbour are set back from the adjacent pair and set well back from the road. Whilst there is a footpath to the rear of houses on Turnberry Close beyond the head of the cul-de-sac, the dwelling is not prominently seen from there due to the high trees and shrubs between the footpath and the side boundary of the appeal site. As such, it has a particularly unobtrusive siting.

4. The proposed development would remove the existing conservatory at the rear, re-position a large existing shed at the side and would extend the dwelling to the side and rear with a single storey 'wraparound' extension, comprising two elements, each with a hipped roof.
5. Although the two new hipped roof forms would differ from the existing main pitched roof, they would match each other in terms of the degree of pitch and style. Given their lower ridge heights, the main roof would remain the dominant element.
6. Whilst the full width of the side part of the extension would be slightly greater than the width of the existing dwelling, this would be partially screened to eaves level by a timber fence and a generous area of side garden would remain. Furthermore, the front part would be stepped in with a reduced width and would have a lower roof. This would reduce the appearance of the overall scale and mass to an acceptable degree when seen from the front and the side and the extension would appear sufficiently subordinate to the main part of the dwelling, as required by the Council's House Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD, 2019).
7. It would not be seen in the approach along Lichfield Avenue until reaching the head of the cul-de-sac and given its set-back from the street, its staggered form and low height, it would not be unduly dominant when seen from there, from the surrounding dwellings to the rear or on Turnberry Close or when glimpsed from the footpath. The leafy character of the head of the cul-de-sac would not be adversely affected.
8. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would not result in significant harm to the character or appearance of the dwelling or the street scene. It accords with the SPD and with development plan policies CP10 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy (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.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, to provide certainty. A condition for matching external materials is also necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the site and the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would accord with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be allowed.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR