



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2025

**By S Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 August 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/25/3368699**

**29, Grange Road, Worsley, Wigan, M28 1AT**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
  - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Knowles against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application reference is A/25/098396/HH.
  - The development proposed is a single storey rear and two storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The proposal is for a two-storey side extension attached to a wraparound single storey rear extension. The Council raise no objection to the single storey rear extension in isolation. Given the size, position and orientation of the single storey rear extension, I do not disagree with the conclusion reached by the local planning authority (LPA) about this element of the proposed development. It is acceptable in terms of its design, and I do not find that it would have a materially harmful effect upon the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
3. Given the above, the main issue is the effect of the two-storey side extension element of proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling falling in an established residential street which includes brick and render properties which are positioned in a linear form and where there is a consistency to both the appearance of the buildings and the pattern of development. The latter includes a prevailing and important rhythm of open gaps between each of the pairs of semi-detached dwellings and functioning mainly as parallel driveways. The consistency to the design and pattern of development in the street adds positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the area. I recognise that there are side extensions at Nos.1 and 37 Grange Road, but these are the exception rather than the norm and are not on such a scale as to lead me to depart from my findings above.
5. The proposed two storey side extension would be positioned about 200mm from the common boundary with No. 31 Grange Road. In this regard, there would be direct conflict with the LPA's House Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD). Paragraph 3.20 states "*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".* Given the position and scale of the proposed two storey side extension, I find that it would unacceptably erode the consistency afforded to the open gap between No. 29 Grange Avenue and No. 31 Grange Avenue to the extent that the loss of the pleasing rhythm of open gaps between properties in this part of the street would be noticeable to passers-by.

6. I recognise that the two-storey side extension would be set back from the existing front wall of the dwelling by approximately one metre, but this would not be sufficient to overcome the harm that would be caused to the consistency of open gaps between the semi-detached blocks of properties in this street. I find that the resultant gap between the host property and No. 31 Grange Road would be such as to create a visual terracing impact, thereby materially harming the overall character and appearance of the street-scene. I also emphasise that in this regard there would also be conflict with the SPD in so far that the extension would not be set in from the common boundary by 800mm which the guidance indicates would avoid the terracing effect.
7. The 800mm set in distance is also a requirement of the SPD in terms of ensuring that bins can be stored to the rear and manoeuvred to the front of the property on collection day.
8. Therefore, given my reasoning above, I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the design, character and appearance requirements of policy CP10 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy 2013, policy JP-P1 of the 2014 Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Document For Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan; the SPD, and chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2025.

## **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that when the single storey rear and two storey side extension are considered together, the development would not accord with the development plan for the area taken as a whole, and there are no material considerations that indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

*S. Hartley*

INSPECTOR