



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2017

**by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 28 July 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/17/3178175**

**1 Gagewell Drive, Horbury, Wakefield WF4 6BP**

- 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 Amanda Ellams against the decision of City of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
  - The application Ref 17/00864/FUL, dated 29 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2017.
  - The development proposed is two-storey extension to side & single-storey extension to rear.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling located in a prominent corner position at the end of Gagewell Drive, near to the junction with Gagewell Lane. The host property has a wide side garden and an open aspect onto Gagewell Drive. A modest detached single storey garage is located near to the side of the dwelling. The immediate surrounding area is residential in character with Gagewell Drive comprising semi-detached dwellings of a similar appearance to the host building. A number of nearby dwellings have two storey side extensions including the adjoining dwelling at 3 Gagewell Drive.
4. The proposed two storey side extension would replace the existing detached garage. It would be over half the width of and at first floor it would be flush with the front elevation of the host building and the eaves and ridge height of roof of the extension would be the same height as the host building. Consequently and as a result of its size, scale, prominent position and particular design, the proposed two storey side extension would not be subservient to the host building but would overwhelm it and would be an overly dominant and unsympathetic addition. The prominent corner position of the appeal site means that the proposed side extension would be very prominent and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

5. Though a number of nearby dwellings have two storey side extensions, all are narrower than that proposed and most are either set back from the front elevation of the host building or if they are flush with the front elevation, are flat roofed.
6. My attention has been drawn to a number of other examples of extensions at 25, 26 and 27 Stannard Well Lane and to an extension allowed at appeal at 3 Oakwood Drive (Ref APP/X4725/D/14/2222463) which are said to be comparable to the proposal. Whilst I have had regard to the other examples referred to and whilst I have been provided with extracts from the appeal decision letter for 3 Oakwood Drive, I am not aware of the details or particular circumstances relating to these cases. However none of the extensions on Stannard Well Lane appear to be as large in scale as that proposed and it appears from the evidence that unlike the proposal, the extension allowed on Oakwood Drive was similar to other extensions nearby. I therefore give these other examples limited weight. In any event, I must determine the proposal before me on its own merits.
7. In reaching my decision I have had regard to the fact that no objections were received from local residents. I also note from the Council's Officer report that the appellant states that her personal circumstances mean that a smaller extension would not be suitable though I have not been provided with any details of these circumstances. The Council raised no objections to the proposed rear extension which also forms part of the proposal. Whilst I have no reason to disagree with the Council's findings in relation to the rear extension, it is linked to and is not therefore severable from the proposed two storey side extension which for the reasons stated above I consider to be harmful.
8. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. It is therefore contrary to policies D9 and D10 of the City of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council Local Development Framework Development Policies, to the Council's Residential Design Guide (adopted 1996) and to section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies and this guidance seek, amongst other things, development to be of a high quality design, to respect and where appropriate enhance the character of the locality and extensions to respect the character and scale of the dwelling.

## **Conclusion**

9. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Beverley Wilders*

INSPECTOR