



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2025

by **J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/25/3363141

197 Camberwell Crescent, Wigan, WN2 1AY

- 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 Edgars and Olga Klimanovica against the decision of Wigan Council.
 - The application Ref is A/24/098346/HH.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a two-storey side extension with dormers to front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a two-storey side extension with dormers to front and rear at 197 Camberwell Crescent, Wigan, WN2 1AY, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref A/24/098346/HH, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Plan Location Map, CC-R00-PR-102 Rev01, CC-R00-PR-103 Rev01.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The planning application form describes the proposal as a single-storey side extension. However, it is clear from the plans and other documentation that it is a two-storey extension and this is stated on the decision notice. I have used the description from the decision notice.

Main issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of Camberwell Crescent

Reasons

4. No 197 is a semi-detached house situated on the eastern side of Camberwell Crescent. The road is characterised by houses of very similar design, taking the form of chalet bungalows with full width front and rear dormers in the roof space. The proposed development would involve the construction of a two-storey side

extension, some 2.3 metres in width, between the current side elevation and the boundary with No 199. It would have an open ground-floor with first-floor accommodation above. It would be set back 1 metre from the main front elevation of the house and would be set down a small amount from the main roof ridge. Materials would match those of the existing dwelling.

5. Policy CP10 of the Council's Local Plan Core Strategy (CS) indicates that the Council will ensure that, as appropriate, new development respects and acknowledges the character and identity of its locality, in terms of the materials, siting, size, scale and details used, and is integrated effectively with its surroundings. This policy is echoed by policy JP-P1 of Places for Everyone (PfE).
6. The Council's House Extensions Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), dated June 2019, notes that side extensions impact on the setting of a house and can also have an impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. The Council will seek to prevent the loss of spaces between buildings where the spaces are important in defining the character of the street scene, and where their loss would give the impression of a continuous built form. Side extensions must, therefore, be well designed, with building materials and styles that match or complement the original house. With regard to two-storey side extensions, a 'terracing effect' should be avoided by stepping in the extension 800mm from the boundary. Also all side extensions should have a lower roofline than the original building.
7. The appellants contend there is an almost identical extension at No 154 opposite which was granted permission after the adoption of the SPD (Ref A/19/88090/HH), and that the planning officer's report acknowledges the existence of another very similar extension at No 158. In the report, the Officer states that 'the proposed side addition will partially fill the gap between the pair of semi-detached properties. However, the proposal will be set-back 1.0 metre from the front elevation, resulting in a side addition that is not highly visible when viewed at advantage points in the street and a gap will remain between the new gable elevation and the neighbours gable. Whilst each proposal must be treated on its own merits, I consider that, in this case, the same conclusion would apply with regard to the current proposal.
8. The report also acknowledges that 'due to its size, scale, design and location, along with materials, the proposed two storey side addition will appear in keeping with the host dwellinghouse. It will be sited within the plot and it will not appear overly prominent when viewed from the street or neighbouring properties and will result in a sub-ordinate addition to the host dwellinghouse as it is well designed'. I concur with that view and, again, the conclusion would also apply in the current case.
9. The semi-detached houses on Camberwell Crescent have relatively narrow gaps between them. Other than when seen from the immediate vicinity of the individual properties, the gaps do not appear as significant features in the street scene, particularly when seen in views along the road, and there are no important views through the gaps themselves. By being set back from the front elevation, the proposed side extension would not be readily visible, and would avoid giving the impression of a continuous built form in longer views up and down the road. In addition, while the proposed extension would be built up to the boundary with the neighbouring No 199, it would be set back around 1 metre from the front elevation and set down from the main roof ridge such that it would appear subservient to the main house. Finally, it would use materials and a style to match the host property.

10. In conclusion, I find that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property or the around Camberwell Crescent. It would not conflict with Policy CP10 of the CS or with Policy JP-P1 of the PfE, and would conform to the main thrust of the guidance in the SPD. Accordingly, I allow this appeal subject to the attached conditions.

Conditions

11. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR