The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2019

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/19/3227316
8 Daw Lane, Horbury, Wakefield, WF4 5DT

- 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 Richard Ellis against the decision of Wakefield Council.
- The application Ref 19/00367/FUL, dated 10 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2019.
- The development proposed is a garage extension to front.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a modern two-storey detached dwelling, with a two-storey extension and a single storey flat roof garage to the side. It is set back from the road by a block paved parking and turning area, bound by a low stone wall and wrought iron railings.

4. The property is located on the end of a row of almost identical properties, which wrap around the nearby corner on to Dudfleet Lane. Millfield House, to the east of the site, is a much older, predominantly stone built, L shaped property, which projects very slightly further forward than the existing garage. 8 Daw Lane and Millfield House are situated on a bend in the road at oblique angles to one another. The wider surrounding area comprises a mixture of modern and traditional buildings of varying scale, design and materials.

5. The appellant wishes to extend the single storey flat roof garage forward by 2 metres in order to create sufficient space within it to park two classic cars. Although the extension itself would be very modest in terms of its scale and height and would be finished in external materials to match the existing building, it would, due to its width and flat roof projection forward of the existing building line, be discordant with the style of the original dwelling and the design and layout of the locality. As such, despite the variety of buildings in the area and despite the house being set back from the public highway, the extension would detract from the character and appearance of the area.

6. I acknowledge that the existing garage is sub-ordinate to and infills a gap between the dwellings on either side of it. However, despite its flat roof, it is noticeably higher than the front and side boundary walls. As such, the 2 metre forward projection would result in the garage appearing much more prominent.

7. For the reasons given above, the development would be contrary to Development Policy D9(a) of the Wakefield Local Development Framework (LDF), which requires new development to respect the locality in terms of design, scale and layout and Policy D10(d) of the LDF, which states that development will only be permitted if it would not be discordant with the style of the original dwelling.

8. Taking all matters into account, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR