



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2020

by John Dowsett MA DipURP DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/20/3244152

11 Shepley Street, Wakefield WF1 4ND

- 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 Arshad Iqbal against the decision of City of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/01193/FUL, dated 12 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: Demolition of conservatory. Rear extensions - part single storey part two storey. Front extensions - part single storey part two storey.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is one half of a pair of traditionally built, semi-detached houses, that has a hipped roof and a stepped front façade with a lower section of roof over the end section of the building. It is located in a predominantly residential area. The surrounding area is comprised largely of two storey houses of a similar age with variations on a small number of basic designs of semi-detached house. It was evident from my site visit that the housing area to the north and east of the appeal building, apart from a small group of older terraced housing on the north side of Stanley Street, was laid out at around the same time as a planned housing estate. Due to the essentially similar ages of the majority of the houses; the use of the same palette of materials; common design features such as hipped roofs, similar window designs and proportions; and the use of houses sited at an angle to face junctions, the area has a pleasingly homogeneous, yet distinctive, character despite the relatively uncomplicated designs of the houses. To the south, on Park Lodge Lane, there is a small group of commercial properties of varying designs and a two storey terrace of late Nineteenth or early Twentieth Century houses. The section of Shepley Street where the appeal building is located consists mainly of houses of the same design as the appeal building.

4. When read together, Policy CS10 of the Wakefield Core Strategy 2009 (the Core Strategy) and Policies D9 and D10 of the Wakefield Development Policies Development Plan Document 2009 (the DPDPD) seek to ensure, among other matters, that new development and extensions to existing houses are of a high standard of design that protects and enhances local character and distinctiveness and has regard to its context. These policies are broadly consistent with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework which expects new development to be of a high standard of design that has regard to its context. More detailed advice on the design of extensions to dwelling houses is contained in Part 2 of the Wakefield District Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (the SPD), which is to be read alongside the more general design policies in the development plan. The SPD advises that extensions to dwellings should appear subordinate to the original house and maintain the visual balance of the property.
5. The appeal proposal would alter the roof from a hip to a gable design with two new projections to the rear, a two storey extension projecting approximately 4.5 metres with a gabled roof and the other a pent roofed, single storey extension, that would project approximately 3 metres. A two storey infill extension is proposed to the front elevation that would bring the currently stepped back end section of the house level with the main front wall. A single storey element projecting approximately 1 metre across the full width of the dwelling is also proposed.
6. I observed during my site visit that in the wider surrounding area there have been no hip to gable alterations and that, whilst a number of properties have been extended to the side, these extensions have incorporated or retained the set back in the façade and the lower ridge where this was a feature of the original house. This aspect of the appeal proposal would be inconsistent with the large number of other houses of a similar age and style, and would be uncharacteristic of the street and the remainder of the estate. The proposed alterations would also be particularly noticeable due to the wider gap between the appeal building and the neighbouring semi-detached pair of houses, which are set at an angle to address the junction. This results in more of the end elevation of the appeal building being visible, particularly from the higher ground to the north.
7. The proposed ground floor front addition would extend across the full width of the house, although it would have a relatively shallow depth. In combination with the first floor extension and roof alteration this would significantly alter the proportions and massing of the house and the appearance of the semi-detached pair. In the surrounding area, although there are some extensions to the front of houses, these are in general limited to small porches at the entrance doors and none extend to the full width of the dwelling. This aspect of the proposal would also be inconsistent with the prevailing character and appearance of the street and surrounding area.
8. The Council has not raised any specific concerns in respect of the proposed rear extensions and, indeed, these would be essentially similar to the extensions that have been carried out to the adjoining house at 9 Shepley Street. I saw when I visited the site that the proposed rear extensions would not have a material effect on the street scene, being largely concealed by the main house, nor would they result in any adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties. However, they are integral to and

not severable from the other elements of the proposal and, consequently, it would not be possible to grant planning permission for this part of the scheme independently of the scheme as a whole.

9. My attention has been drawn to an approved side extension at the adjoining property at number 9, and I was able to see this when I visited the site. Although this extension increases the width of the property frontage, it does not extend the property forwards and it retains the step in the façade of the building. It also has a hipped roof that follows the line of the existing lower ridge. This retains much of the original appearance of the house despite the increase in width. This differs from the appeal proposal, which would result in the step in the façade being removed, increase the ridge height to the end portion of the house, and create a gable end to the roof.
10. I have also noted the appellant's point regarding the extensions to numbers 18 and 20 Shepley Street¹. I do not have any information regarding the circumstances which led to these being accepted or the policies that were in place at the time. However, I saw that, in addition to the pair of semi-detached houses originally having a different design to the appeal building, the extensions are more or less identical and appear to have been carried out contemporaneously as the same bricks and roof tiles have been used in both. As a result, these extensions are a balanced architectural composition and the visual effect of the resulting difference in form is offset by the presence of an electricity substation building, rather than houses, on the opposite quadrant of the junction.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would not comply with the relevant requirements of Core Strategy Policy CS10, DPDPD Policies D9 and D10, and the guidance in the SPD.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Dowsett

INSPECTOR

¹ Referred to as 16 and 18 Shepley Street in the appellant's statement.