



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 13 September 2021

by Mark Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/21/3276036

14 Beacon View, South Kirkby, Pontefract WF9 3BY

- 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 Bethal against the decision of the City of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00133/FUL, dated 21 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey extension to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in July 2021. Since its content does not materially alter the national policy situation in regard to the main issues of the appeal and as such the cases of the main parties would not be prejudiced, I have not sought their views. I have referred to the 2021 Framework in my decision.
3. The Council's second reason for refusal refers to the submitted plans being inaccurate, which meant that the impact of the development was unclear and made a full assessment against relevant policies and guidance impossible. I note that amended plans and elevations were submitted during the course of the application which were more consistent. Some minor discrepancies remain, notably between precise dimensions and the position of the existing window and door on the western side elevation of the existing building. Nevertheless, they relate to minor details and the plans I have before me are sufficiently clear to enable me to reach a view on the proposal.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal building is a two storey detached dwelling, in amongst other detached and semi detached examples of a very similar design, detailing and scale. Most have forward projecting single storey extensions made up of garages and porches with both flat and pitched roofs. The land rises to the west. Whilst there is some variation to front elevations by virtue of front extensions, there remains a

pleasant homogeneity to buildings in the street scene. Deep front gardens contribute positively to a spacious character.

6. The appeal scheme would be of substantial size and whilst set down from the ridge height of the appeal building, it would be an imposing feature in the street scene. It would not project any further forward than the extent of the existing garage, but its height and bulk would nonetheless interrupt the even rhythm set by overwhelmingly single storey front extensions, noticeably reduce the spaciousness of the front garden and thus the street. In addition, the width of the extension would give rise to a very shallow roof pitch which would sit uncomfortably in design terms with both the existing dwelling and those around it.
7. Prior approval was granted in May 2021¹ to add an additional storey to the appeal building under Class AA of the GPDO². There is therefore something of a fallback position to consider. The degree of weight to be given to the fallback position depends on whether or not it would be equally or more harmful than the appeal scheme.
8. The prior approval scheme would see the eaves and ridge height of the building increased so that it would become a three-storey dwelling. This would have some impact on the street scene as the host property would then be higher than the neighbouring properties on either side. However, the difference in height would be disguised to some extent by the staggered roof line along this side of Beacon View due to the increase in land levels to the west. The additional storey would reflect the appearance of the front elevation of the property in terms of fenestration and the overall roof shape would be retained. Unlike the appeal proposal, the prior approval scheme would not bring the building forward or increase its footprint. Consequently, the fallback position would not present a greater degree of harm to the character and appearance of the host building or wider street scene. I am not therefore minded to allow the appeal in this light.
9. The proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policy CS10 of the Wakefield Metropolitan District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2009) and Policies D9 and D10 of the Wakefield Metropolitan District Council Local Development Framework Development Policies Document (2009). These require, among other things, that development be of high quality design which respects local character. The proposal would also conflict with paragraph 130 of the Framework, which, amongst other things, requires development to be sympathetic to local character.
10. The appeal scheme would also be contrary to the Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2018) which advises, amongst other things, that front extensions often upset building lines and architectural rhythms, and appear unduly prominent in the street scape, especially where a row of properties has a uniform character.

Other Matters

11. The proposal would provide enlarged accommodation for the appellant, I am not however persuaded that the appeal scheme is the only approach to achieving

¹ Council ref. 21/00131/ADS

² Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

this. I would therefore ascribe this matter limited weight. I also note that the proposed development would be constructed of matching materials. Positive though this would be, it would not make the size, siting or design of it acceptable.

12. The extensions at Nos 6, 18 and 32 Beacon View and 3 Kirkby Close are single storey, which are therefore not comparable in scale or design to the appeal proposal. The two-storey front extensions on Brierley Crescent and at 4 Beacon View relate to semi-detached properties and do not extend across the full width of those properties. These are therefore of a smaller scale than the proposal before me and are seen within differing contexts. I have assessed the appeal scheme on its own merits.

Conclusion

13. I would attach substantial weight to the harm I have found and the subsequent conflict with the development plan and the Framework. There are no other material considerations that would indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Mark Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR