



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2017

by Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/17/3179412
115 Park Road, Castleford WF10 4RU

- 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 Miss Emma Chilton against the decision of City of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00317/FUL, dated 6 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension to the side of the property and single storey extension to the rear of the property which will be the full width of the existing property and the two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene along Park Road.

Reasons

3. The houses on the eastern side of Park Road are set behind an access road. This runs parallel to the A650 which leads onto a large roundabout leading to the M62. Opposite is a predominantly commercial area.
4. The majority of the houses are modest red brick semi-detached properties with hipped roofs with a door and bay window at ground floor. This is spanned by a mono pitch hipped roof reflecting the roof design of the two semi-detached properties. The adjoining property follows a similar design. I observed some detached houses and a number of dwellings which had been rendered but the majority of the houses are unaltered semi-detached properties. As a consequence, there is uniformity in the streetscape which adds to the character of the area.
5. 115 Park Road is one of the widest plots on the street. Consequently, the proposed two storey side extension and single storey rear extension could be built without forming a terraced effect between it and no 113.
6. However, the design of the appeal proposal at the front and rear elevations is simply to extend the property to the side and to run the roof across with no set

back, or changes in roof level, between the original and extended property. I note that at the rear there would be a mono pitch roof running the length of the property at ground floor. However, this horizontal emphasis would only accentuate the asymmetrical appearance of the property when viewed with its neighbour.

7. I am aware of the appellant's desire to be able to provide an additional bedroom and additional living space for her family. However, as a result of the absence of any set back or differentiation between the host property and its extension, the appeal property would appear out of scale with the adjacent house and this would impact on the symmetry of the properties. This would not be consistent with the advice contained within Appendix 1 of the Residential Design Guide adopted 1996 in relation to house extensions, which whilst it is relatively old, nonetheless, provides a useful consideration of good principles of design which are relevant to the appeal before me. The proposed development would appear incongruous in the wider streetscape and would not respect or enhance the character of the wider area. Consequently, it would be contrary to Policies D9 and D10 of the Development Policies Documents adopted 2009, and Policy CS 10 of the City of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council Core Strategy 2009 which require development to be of a high quality design that protects and enhances the existing character and appearance of an area. These policies remain consistent with paragraph 64 of the Framework that permission should be refused for development of poor design.

Other matters

8. At the time of my site visit I took the opportunity to view the properties to which I have been referred on Stainburn Avenue. However, I am not familiar with the background and details of the specific developments. Moreover, I have determined the appeal proposal on the basis of the individual merits of the case before me.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I dismiss the appeal.

L. Nurser

INSPECTOR