



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2025

by **E Fawcett BA (Jt Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/W/25/3371683

75A Treen Road, Tyldesley, Wigan M29 7HB

- 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 & Mrs D Orrell against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is A/24/97219/HH.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of new 1 no 1/2 storey garage with upper floor granny flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 77 and 79 Treen Road, with particular regard to outlook, natural light and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is located within a residential area of a suburban character. There is a mix of two-storey dwellings and bungalows, with a predominance of semi-detached properties. Many of the two-storey dwellings in the immediate area share similar design features, including hipped catslide roofs. The dwelling at the appeal site is a large detached two storey building with a lower projecting element that includes a dormer window and half hipped roof. The dwelling is set back from the road, viewed between two pairs of semi-detached bungalows.
4. The proposed building would be sited close to the boundaries of both 77 and 79 Treen Road (Nos 77 and 79), a pair of semi-detached bungalows. Due to the height and massing of the proposed building and its slightly elevated position, it would be visible within the street scene and, as a result, would appear overly large and visually dominating in relation to the adjacent bungalows, particularly given its overall scale and proximity to these properties. As a result, it would fail to respect the scale and massing of the neighbouring development and would affect the character and appearance of the street scene contrary to the council's House Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (page 19).

5. The proposal would have a 'Dutch hipped' roof which would reflect features of the host dwelling and would be built of materials to match. However, this would not overcome the harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified.
6. I therefore conclude that the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and 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) which seek to ensure that new development respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality, is integrated effectively with its surroundings and helps to create attractive places.

Living conditions

7. The council have not been specific about the harm to living conditions in the reason for refusal, however this is derived from the scale, siting and design of the proposal. From the officer report, it is clear that this relates to outlook, light and privacy.
8. No 77 has a conservatory at the rear of the property which connects to a living room via a wide glazed sliding door. The conservatory and the glazed door serving the living room would both directly face the proposal. A bedroom window would also face the proposed development, although this would be slightly offset. The council's SPD sets out that garages and outbuildings should be sited in such a way that neighbouring houses are not adversely affected in terms of obtrusiveness, overlooking and overshadowing.
9. The proposed building would be close to the boundary with No 77 and would create a sense of overbearing and enclosure which would be detrimental to the outlook of the occupants from both the dwelling and the garden. This harm would be exacerbated by the elevated nature of the site in relation to the dwelling and would not be mitigated by the half hip design to the roof. The proposed development would therefore conflict with the SPD. Although there would be a loss of outlook, it is unlikely that there would be a significant loss of natural light given the position of the proposal to the north of the dwelling.
10. No 79 also shares a boundary with the appeal site. Although the occupants would have views of the proposed development, it would not result in an unacceptable loss of outlook due to the set back from the boundary, its position in relation to the dwelling at No 79, and the amount of garden afforded by this property. Whilst there would be several windows in the roof slope facing the garden, given their position in relation to the upper floor level of the proposed building, they would not result in a significant loss of privacy, due to overlooking, to this neighbouring property.
11. I therefore conclude that, although the proposal would not affect the living conditions of the occupiers of No 79, it would unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupants of 77 Treen Road, with particular reference to their outlook. This would conflict with Policy CP17 of the Wigan Local Plan, Core Strategy (2013) which seeks to ensure that, amongst other things, development does not have an unacceptable adverse impact on amenity and quality of life.

Other Matters

12. I accept that the building would allow the appellant to create secure storage for both possessions and vehicles, with the potential to provide future accommodation

for older parents should the need for extra care arise. I also acknowledge the location of the appeal property in relation to transport connections to shops and services. These matters are neutral in my consideration of the appeal and do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

E Fawcett

INSPECTOR