The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2017

**by Nigel Harrison BA (Hons) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 24th April 2017**

**Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/W/16/3161085**
**376 Castleford Road, Normanton, WF6 1QY**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Maisuria against the decision of City of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
- The application Ref: 16/00953/FUL dated 18 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 June 2016.
- The development proposed is 'proposed work to the roof and change of shopfront'.

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to retain the 'proposed work to the roof and change of shopfront' at 376 Castleford Road, Normanton, WF6 1QY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 16/00953/FUL dated 18 April 2016.

## Procedural Matter

2. The proposal is retrospective, as the development has already taken place in accordance with the submitted details. However, I intend to consider the appeal on the basis of the proposal being for the alterations to the roof and changes to the shopfront.

## Main Issue

3. Notwithstanding all other matters, the Council has raised no objections in principle to the alterations to the shop front, which appear to comprise repainting and the fitting of double glazing. Based on what I have seen and read, I find no reason to disagree. The Council's main concern relates to the new pitched roof, and as such the one main issue in this case is the effect of the new roof on the character and appearance of the host building and the streetscene in Castleford Road and Coronation Street.

## Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a single-storey shop (currently vacant) on the corner of Castleford Road and Coronation Street. Properties along both these streets are generally two-storeys in height with pitched roofs, and follow regular building lines. The shop unit previously had a flat roof, and this has been replaced with a shallow pitched roof with red clay tiles. The triangular areas between the roof slope and the top of the shop front have been covered with a white cladding material.

5. Amongst other considerations, Policy D9 of the *Wakefield Local Development Framework Development Policies Document* (DPD) requires all development to make a positive contribution to the locality by virtue of high quality design. It says proposals should respect, and where appropriate, enhance the locality in terms of design, scale, massing, height, materials and colour. DPD Policy D16 concerns new shop fronts, and says these should respect the character and identity of the street scene.

6. The Council says the pitched roof creates a prominent and incongruous feature which appears out of character with the host building and neighbouring properties due to its materials, colour, design and scale.

7. However, in the context of the surrounding area I consider the pitched roof would not undermine the architectural integrity of the host building and would respect the character of the area to which it relates. The pitch of the roof is fairly shallow, and as such it has little visual impact on the street scene. For the same reason I do not agree with the Council that scale of the roof would significantly increase the size of the building and add to its prominence.

8. The *National Planning Policy Framework* requires local planning authorities to encourage high quality design. However, it also says policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes, but should concentrate on guiding the development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the area generally. I have some reservations concerning the choice of white cladding, which is somewhat jarring and stark in appearance. Overall however, on balance I am satisfied that the proposal would not materially harm the character and appearance of the host building and the streetscene in Castleford Road and Coronation Street. As such, I find no conflict with DPD Policies D9 (a), (b), and D16.

9. I have considered the imposition of conditions in the light of the advice in the *Planning Practice Guidance*. However, as the development has already taken place, no conditions are necessary in this case.

10. I note the comments made by an adjoining occupier that he will now have difficulty accessing the gable end and roof of his property should the need arise. Reference has also been made to external and internal damage, encroachment, and the *Party Wall etc Act 1996*. However, whilst I note these concerns, these are separate legal matters and are outside the scope of this appeal which can only address planning considerations.

11. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Nigel Harrison*

INSPECTOR