
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/17/3174478

2 Church Close, Hemsworth, Pontefract WF9 4SJ

- 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 Mrs Karen Keighley against the decision of City of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00092/FUL, dated 10 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as alteration extension of the garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. Planning permission was originally granted for a single storey extension to the side of the dwelling, including rooms within the roof space, on 9 June 2016¹. The development carried out subsequently did not reflect that on the approved drawings. The application that forms the subject of the appeal in effect sought permission retrospectively for the 'as built' development. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. 2 Church Close is a two-storey detached house with a hipped roof situated in a generous plot in a short cul-de-sac off Station Road. The plot backs onto Rectory Garth, a cul-de-sac of detached properties which are of a similar style. The site is set in a mature landscape and land levels rise at the rear such that Rectory Garth is set at a higher level.
5. The extension, which replaced a garage on the site, is situated at the side of the dwelling, set back from the front elevation but projecting beyond the rear wall of the property. It provides ancillary accommodation to the main part of the dwelling.

¹ Planning Application ref: 16/00920/FUL

6. Policies D9 and D10 of the Council's Local Development Framework Development Policies Document require, amongst other things, that new development respects the character of an area and is not discordant with the style of the original dwelling. The Council's Residential Design Guide 1996 offers guidance to developers to meet a similar aim, and advises that extensions should be subordinate in appearance to the original dwelling and reflect its features.
7. The extension has a bulky, steeply pitched roof which is disproportionate to the size and scale of the extension itself, resulting in a top-heavy form. The gable end exacerbates its bulk and the small hip on the eastern side adjoining the host dwelling appears awkward. Moreover, because of its design and appearance, it does not reflect the proportions or the form of the dwelling. Its awkwardness is exacerbated by the use of non-matching roof materials. I acknowledge that the extension has a smaller footprint than the dwelling and is lower in height but as a result of its design it is a discordant feature on the building.
8. Viewed from the front, the extension is set well back from the front elevation such that it does not have an overbearing impact on the host property. Added to that it is well screened by mature trees and vegetation and is not visible from Station Road. However the extension, and in particular the long slope of the roof, is highly prominent from within Rectory Garth where its visual incompatibility with the host dwelling is clear. Furthermore, the prominence of the roof form viewed from this side is exacerbated by the change in land levels and by its projection beyond the rear elevation of the property closer to the highway.
9. From what I have seen it appears that the original application drawings were not drawn to scale and contain a number of errors leading to the roof being considerably more substantial than was originally planned. Whilst I accept that the overall height relative to that of the original dwelling is as originally approved, the roof as built is considerably bulkier and steeper than that previously permitted. I acknowledge that the permitted extension had a pitched roof, although the plans appear to show a hipped roof to the side elevation. Notwithstanding that, the gable is considerably larger and more dominant than previously indicated.
10. I accept that the development does not have a detrimental impact on highway safety or on the living conditions of neighbouring residents. I also acknowledge that the extension is of considerable benefit to the appellant in terms of meeting her family's accommodation needs. However such benefit does not outweigh the harm I have identified.
11. For the reasons set out the proposal has a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host property and that of Rectory Garth, contrary to the Policies D9 and D10 of the DPD set out above. Consequently, taking all other matters raised into account, the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR