



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by J Moore BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/25/3368224

16 Willowcroft Avenue, Aspull, Wigan WN2 1QJ

- 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 David Sutton against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref is A/24/098176/HH.
- The development proposed was originally described as: Proposed two-storey side extension creating garage & new bedroom with en-suite & new porch to front of property.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant contends that no opportunity was provided by the Council to address concerns about parking before the decision was made. The appellant's submissions to the appeal include a new site plan which seeks to amend the scheme. The new site plan seeks to demonstrate that the existing land within the frontage of the appeal property would allow parking for two vehicles and is stated to require the "re-landscaping of the land to the driveway and installation of a lowered curb".
3. Procedural guidance¹ sets out that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and there are no provisions within the Rules for amendments to be submitted. It is important that what is considered by the Inspector at appeal is essentially the same scheme that was considered by the local planning authority and by interested parties at the application stage. In considering whether to accept the amended scheme, I have had regard to the 'Wheatcroft Principles' and the judgement in Holborn².
4. Even though the proposed development would still be for a two-storey extension and porch, the amended scheme would alter the access arrangements to the highway, and the appearance of the appeal site. The Council's appeal consultation letter clearly sets out that the appeal is proceeding under the Householder Appeals Service, and that there is no opportunity for further comment. Therefore, the Council, consultees and third parties have not had an opportunity to comment on the amended scheme, including persons who did not comment on the original scheme, but might wish to comment on the amended scheme. For these reasons, I cannot accept the amended scheme, in both procedural and substantive terms. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the application as submitted, and upon which the Council made its decision. In doing so, I have disregarded

¹ Section 16 of the Procedural Guide: Planning appeals – England, 30 June 2025

² Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd v SSE [JPL 1982 P37]; Holborn Studios Ltd v The Council of the London Borough of Hackney [2017] EWHC 2823 (Admin).

some of the written content of the appellant's appeal statement insofar as it refers to the amended scheme.

Main Issue

5. The appeal site is in the Green Belt. The Council considers that the proposed development would not be inappropriate development within the Green Belt, on the grounds that it would not result in a disproportionate addition. I find no reason to consider otherwise. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposal upon highway safety.

Reasons

6. The reason for refusal concerns car parking standards. Saved Policy A1S of the Wigan Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP) refers to maximum car parking standards and therefore does not entirely conform to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which has long moved away from such an approach. However, the Council's Policy Note: Car Parking Standards for New Development 2023 (PN) sets out a revised position, which is in general conformity with the current Framework.
7. The host property is a dwelling house within a cul-de-sac comprising semi-detached dwellings. The existing property includes two off street parking spaces within the driveway, which leads to an existing garage style outbuilding near the rear of the plot. The proposed two storey extension includes an integral garage and a bedroom, such that the property would become a four bedroomed dwelling. The proposal would not permit vehicular access the existing garage style building.
8. The PN sets out the Council's standards for car parking spaces. To be counted as an off-street parking space, dimensions should be at least 5m x 3m. An additional length of 1m is required to allow for a garage door, and an additional width of 0.5m is required where a space adjoins a wall or boundary feature, and/or where the driveway provides principal access for people to/from the property. The Council's standards clearly accept garages, subject to acceptable dimensions and clearances.
9. The submitted plan indicates the external dimensions of the integral garage to be 6.25m x 2.75m and the appellant states that its internal dimensions are 5.65m x 2.45m. This would clearly fall short of the Council's standards.
10. Drawing the above together, the proposal would result in one off-street parking space to serve a four bedroomed dwelling house. This would be well short of the three spaces normally required for a four bedroomed house in the Council's standards. In the Council's view, such a lower level of parking provision would likely result in additional demand for on-street parking, and this is not disputed by the appellant. I find no reason to consider otherwise.
11. Parking spaces on the street are limited by the presence of driveways around the head of the cul-de-sac. The arrangement is such that driveway entrances meet neighbouring driveways at the back of the footway and include boundary walling and/or fencing to a low level. Due to this arrangement, off-street parking spaces are constrained. Increased demand for on street parking would likely result in obstructions to driveways and footways, and refuse collection vehicles, delivery vehicles and cars would be unable to safely enter and exit the cul-de-sac in

forward gear. The proposal would therefore lead to potential conflicts between highway users, including pedestrians and cyclists.

12. Other off-street parking spaces are likely available outside of the cul-de-sac in the wider residential estate. However, for convenience, unloading and to enable natural surveillance, drivers would likely wish to park near their homes in the cul-de-sac. Consequently, competition for off-street parking would likely result in drivers undertaking reversing and other manoeuvres to exit the cul-de-sac, resulting in potential conflicts between highway users, including pedestrians and cyclists.
13. Consequently, I find that increased parking demand would not be safely accommodated within the vicinity of the proposed development without an unacceptable risk to highway safety. This conflicts with the PN and the Council's House Extensions Design Guide 2019, which, when taken together, seek to ensure that extensions which increase off-street parking demand do not result in detriment to highway safety, taking into account the availability of convenient and safe off-street parking.
14. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposal would result in unacceptable risk to highway safety. It conflicts with Policy CP7 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy 2013, UDP Saved Policy A1S and Policy JP-C8 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 2024. Taken together, these policies seek to ensure that development proposals ensure a safe highway network, safe and secure access for all, and appropriate parking provision.

Other Matters

15. The appellant advises that no opportunity was given by the Council to amend the scheme. However, the handling of the planning application by the Council is not a matter that affects my consideration of the planning merits of the proposal.

Conclusion

16. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

J Moore

INSPECTOR