



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2025 by S Jamieson BA(Hons) MPlan

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/25/3362276

2 Burnside Close, Tyldesley, Wigan M29 7GN

- 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 William Gregory against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is A/24/97866/HH.
 - The development proposed is a double storey rear extension and first floor front extension and gable canopy over front door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. Reason '1' on the Council's decision notice relates to 'the proposed development', whereas Reasons '2' and '3' specifically relate to the two-storey rear extension, (otherwise referred to as the 'double storey rear extension' in the description of development). Therefore, the main issues have been defined on this basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - a) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area;
 - b) the effect of the proposed two-storey rear extension on the living conditions of occupiers of 4 Burnside Close (No 4), with particular regard to outlook; and
 - c) the effect of the proposed two-storey rear extension on the living conditions of occupiers of the appeal dwelling (No 2), with particular regard to external amenity space.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

5. No 2 is a detached, two storey dwelling which occupies a prominent corner plot on Burnside Close, a suburban cul-de-sac. The front elevation of No 2 is set slightly forward of the neighbouring dwelling at 4 Burnside Close (No 4), but they share a similar design aesthetic and sit comfortably alongside each other. There is variation in the design of dwellings on the wider cul-de-sac with a mix of gable sided and gable fronted dwellings. However, there is much commonality in terms of the scale of the dwellings with a predominance of brickwork facing materials. There is also repetition of architectural detailing on front elevations such as the single storey, mono-pitched front projections, and at first floor level the similar window proportions, often with small gable features above. Whilst extensions are commonplace, first floor front projecting extensions are not. Overall, these characteristics give much order and consistency to the street scene.
6. The Wigan Council House Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (DG) confirms amongst other things that householder development must complement the existing house, be positioned so they do not dominate the street scene and that careful attention be given to window proportions and styles. Furthermore, the DG sets out that, to ensure an extension does not detract from the appearance of a house and the character of the local area, it should be constructed from building materials that match or complement the main building.
7. I acknowledge that the first floor front extension would not lead to any increase in footprint and its roof would be set down from the main ridge. Even so, it would form a wide gable feature which, given its projection forward at first floor level and its position close to the boundary with No 4, would accentuate the stagger and significantly reduce the cohesion between these dwellings. In combination with the three-paned first floor window, light rendered finish and uncharacteristic gable canopy over the front door, the front extension would not complement the host dwelling and would also significantly contrast with the prevailing characteristics of other dwellings on Burnside Close. This would be very noticeable to passers-by given the dwelling's prominent corner location at the entrance to the cul-de-sac.
8. Whilst there are first floor, front projections along Wycombe Drive, from what I saw, these are mainly an integral feature of the design of dwellings on that street and are not similar to the design of the appeal proposal. Furthermore, in contrast to the first floor mock Georgian façade treatment to some of the dwellings on Wycombe Drive, the proposed drawings show render is to be applied at both ground and first floor levels. Consequently, the extent of the render would appear very stark, unacceptably increasing the prominence of the extension particularly given the general absence of render to front elevations on Burnside Close.
9. The proposed rear extension would be set away from the boundary with Wycombe Drive and would partially be obscured at street level by boundary fencing. Even so, given its two-storey scale, the contrasting light rendered finish would unduly increase its prominence in the street where it would be seen to significantly contrast with the brickwork of its host and neighbouring properties on Burnside Close.
10. My attention has been drawn to other extensions at Burnside Close, Wycombe Drive, Burnett Close, Eggar Close, Kentmore Drive and Ennerdale Road. However, I am not aware of the material planning considerations in each case. In any event,

from what I have seen, none are of the same design as the appeal proposal and these limited examples do not justify the appeal development which, for the reasons set out, would appear incongruous amongst its immediate surroundings.

11. I conclude, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Thus, it would conflict with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024) and Policy CP10 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy (2013) (CS) which, amongst other things, require development to respect and acknowledge the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials and to integrate effectively with its surroundings. For the same reasons, the proposal would conflict with the DG and the requirements for good design in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Living conditions – No 4

12. The proposed rear extension would result in a degree of change in terms of how surrounding built form is experienced from the rear garden of No 4. However, the extension would be modest in depth and set away from the shared boundary meaning it would not breach the DGs '45 degree rule'. Even accounting for existing built form, including the side elevation of 6 Burnside Close and the single storey garage at No 2, No 4's relatively wide garden would retain a suitably spacious outlook.
13. For these reasons, the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of occupiers of No 4. In this particular regard, it would therefore comply with Policies CP10 and CP17 of the CS which require development to have an acceptable impact on amenity and quality of life. It would also be consistent with Paragraph 135 of the Framework, which seek a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Living conditions – No 2

14. The appeal site occupies a generous corner plot, and given the limited extent of the proposed rear projection, the development would not result in a significant reduction of space to the rear of the property. The remaining space would be proportionate to the size of the dwelling in this suburban context. Although the SPD does not prescribe minimum numerical standards for external amenity space, it states that private rear gardens should be of sufficient size to accommodate 'outdoor recreational activities'. The retained space would be sufficient to allow occupiers to undertake activities such as sitting out, drying clothes and storage of domestic paraphernalia. Accordingly, I find no conflict with the SPD in this respect.
15. For the aforementioned reasons, the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of occupiers of the appeal dwelling. In that particular regard, it would be consistent with Policies CP10 and CP17 of the CS which require development to have an acceptable impact on amenity and quality of life. For the reasons set out it would also accord with the DG and the high standard of amenity requirements at Paragraph 135 of the Framework.

Other Matters

16. While the appellant has submitted evidence relating to neighbouring privacy, light levels, and flood risk, these issues are not contested between the main parties.

However, regardless of their acceptability, they do not mitigate the identified harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. I have found that the proposal would have an acceptable relationship with the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No 4 and the occupiers of the host dwelling. However, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. For this reason and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR