



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2025

by **L Fern BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: **11 MARCH 2025**

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/24/3355604

23 Ashley Road, Hindley Green, Wigan WN2 4HG

- 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 Andrew Jolly against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is A/24/97239/RET.
 - The development is described as front and rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I noted from the appeal evidence that the proposed development has already been constructed, which was confirmed by my site visit observations. The development has largely been completed in-line with the submitted plans.
3. The description of development set out in the banner heading above has been amended from that on the application form and Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council's (the Council) official decision notice to remove the words 'retrospective' and 'retention of', which do not constitute acts of development.
4. Two representations, from interested parties during the planning application process, were submitted by the Council alongside their appeal questionnaire, which had the writers' addresses redacted. The Council was unable to provide the appellant with copies of the unredacted versions due to their data protection policy, and therefore in the interests of fairness, I have not had sight of the representations and cannot take their contents into consideration in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dormers on the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. Ashley Road is a residential cul-de-sac predominantly comprising semi-detached traditional style bungalows with hipped roofs. Some of the bungalows have been retrofitted with dormer windows to the front and/or rear, which are of varying styles, sizes and materials. However, the prevailing design is of dormers that sit either on the ridgeline or just below it, and dormers that either do not project beyond the side roof slope or sit only marginally beyond it. Many of the bungalows on Ashley Road have not had dormers installed at all and retain their hipped roof design in

full, which contribute positively to the overall character and appearance of the area.

7. Front and rear dormers have been installed at No 23 Ashley Road (No 23), which are the subject of this appeal. The dormers extend above the ridgeline of the original roof, and in terms of width, extend across a large proportion of the side roof slope. They create a continuous flat roof that extends across the length of the dormers. Single windows have been installed in both the front and rear dormers. Mid-brown coloured cladding has been utilised, with white windows, fascia boards, and guttering.
8. The dormers at No 23 are large in scale, both in terms of width and height. They extend across a large proportion of the original roof, undermining the existing hipped roof design that is prevalent and contributes to the character and appearance of the area. The extension of the dormers across much of the side roof slope, together with the large expanse of flat roof, create a box shape that dominates and unbalances the property, especially when seen in the context of the adjacent semi-detached property. Its dominance is most acutely observed from the side when viewed from Ashley Road.
9. The appellant asserts that the materials used align with neighbouring properties. I acknowledge that existing dormers on Ashley Road utilise a range of materials. However, the use of mid-brown coloured cladding as the main external material appears at odds with the property itself, against the existing light-coloured roof tiles, having the effect of accentuating the dormers' dominance over the property and the street scene.
10. The dormer windows appear at odds with the alignment of the windows at ground floor level, both to the front and rear of the property, which has resulted in a conflicted elevational design to the detriment of the appearance of the property and the surrounding area.
11. For the reasons set out above, I find significant harm to the character and appearance of the property and area, contrary to policy CP10 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy (2013) and policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document for, amongst other locations, Wigan (2024). These policies seek to improve the built environment by, amongst other matters, ensuring development respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality, and integrates effectively with its surroundings.

Other Matters

12. I have had careful regard to the appellant's personal circumstances. Whilst it is understandable that there has been a desire to alter the property resulting from the health issues experienced by a member of the household, no evidence has been presented to demonstrate that a dormer extension of this nature is required. I have found that there is significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, which outweighs the personal considerations put forward.
13. The appellant's evidence refers to the conduct of the Council during the planning application process. However, this is not a matter for my deliberation in the context of a planning appeal.

14. The development's compliance with Building Regulations has been forwarded as a benefit of the proposed development in evidencing the contribution of the dormers to a safe and functional family home environment. Whilst this may be the case, this is not a matter for consideration in the context of a planning appeal and I have based my decision on the planning merits of the scheme.

Conclusion

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole, and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Fern

INSPECTOR