

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2017

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 08 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/17/3173130

4 Andrew Crescent, Wakefield, WF1 2LP

- 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 John Moss against the decision of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00214/FUL, dated 27 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a two-storey side extension with wrap around front extension and canopy.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a two-storey side extension with wrap around front extension and canopy at 4 Andrew Crescent, Wakefield, WF1 2LP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/00213/FUL, dated 27 January 2017, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Plan, Drawings No 003 (Rev B), 004 (Rev B).
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of Andrew Crescent.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, brick-built, semi-detached house, situated on a corner plot, at a point where Andrew Crescent turns an almost 90 degree bend. The appeal site is on the inside of the bend and is therefore approximately triangular, with a wide frontage and narrow rear boundary. The proposed development would involve the construction of a two-storey side extension to incorporate a garage and utility room to the ground floor and a bedroom with en-suite to the first floor.
-

4. Policy D9 of the Wakefield Development Policies Document (DPD) indicates that development proposals should respect the character of the locality in terms of, amongst other things, design, scale, massing, height, materials and colour. Policy D10 of the DPD indicates that house extensions should not be discordant with the style of the original dwelling or result in significant harm to the character of the area. The Appendix to the Council's Residential Design Guide (RDG) indicates that house extensions should normally be subordinate in appearance to the original dwelling and reflect its features, including openings and materials. The RDG also notes that side extensions should avoid creating a terraced effect, and that this could be achieved by setting such extensions back from the boundary or the front elevation of the original building.
5. In this case, the proposed extension would project slightly beyond the front elevation at ground floor level, with a wrap-around canopy roof above the front of the garage and front door, but would be set back a small amount at first floor level. It would be similarly set back from the rear elevation, and the roof ridge would be set down a little from the ridge of the main roof. It would have matching materials and window design and detail, and it would have a hipped roof to match the host dwelling and the other dwellings along the crescent, all of which have a similar basic design. On this basis, I consider that the extension would not appear discordant with the style of the original dwelling and it would respect the character of the dwelling and its locality.
6. The appeal property occupies a corner plot on the inside of the bend along the crescent. As such there is a significant gap between the front elevations of No 4 and the neighbouring No 6, which are at an angle of almost 90 degrees from one another. There is a similar proposal for a side extension at No 6, which is the subject of a separate appeal decision, but even if both extensions were allowed, there would still be a gap of somewhere around 10 metres between the fronts of the two houses, reducing to around 1 metre at the rear. In terms of the street scene, the effective visual gap from any meaningful position along the road would remain considerable, whilst the narrow gap at the rear would only be apparent from immediately opposite the houses, at the bend in the road. On this basis, the proposed extension at No 4 would not result in any significant harm to the street scene.
7. There is no indication from the Council that there is any inherent value in the views between pairs of houses on the crescent per se, other than maintaining a degree of general openness. By virtue of the position of the appeal property on the inside of a bend on the road, and the resultant gap between the property and the neighbouring No 6, I consider that the extension would have no significant detrimental impact on this openness. Finally, I acknowledge that the width of the extended house would be greater than that of the adjoining semi, and that it would introduce an element of asymmetry. However, the position of No 4, on an unusual corner plot, would mean that any loss of symmetry would not be a significantly detrimental element in the overall street scene.
8. In conclusion, I find that the proposed extension would not be discordant or out of character with the host property or the locality. Furthermore, by virtue of its position in the street scene and its largely set back and set down nature, it would appear subservient to the main dwelling and would not be a dominant feature in the streetscape. Finally, with or without the proposed extension at the neighbouring No 6, it would not result in a terracing effect, by virtue of the

substantial remaining gap between the fronts of the properties, which are the main components of the street scene along the crescent. On this basis, the proposal would not conflict with Policies D9 or D10 of the DPD, or with guidance in the RDG.

Conditions

9. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR