



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2021

by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/21/3276513

42 Park Avenue, Castleford, West Yorkshire WF10 4JT

- 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 Jamie Price against the decision of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02337/FUL, dated 22 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 2 storey sideways extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the application was determined, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') has been published. The main parties were given the opportunity to comment on any relevant implications for the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - The character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of 40 Park Avenue, having regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. 42 Park Avenue is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located within a residential area. Due to the topography of the area, No 42 sits higher than its driveway and the dwellings to the north west. The host dwelling has a large gap to the side boundary compared to other dwellings within Park Avenue.
5. The adjoining dwelling is largely unaltered and maintains a gable roof. The surrounding area is primarily characterised by semi-detached dwellings. There are also detached dwellings and terraces. The design of properties within the street scene varies. I noted on my site visit that a number of properties within Park Avenue have been extended, including the host property. These

extensions generally read as subordinate additions and are in keeping with the surrounding area.

6. The extension would be set back from the front elevation, incorporate a hipped roof set down from the ridge and matching materials are proposed. It would fill the majority of the gap to the side boundary and would significantly increase the scale and massing of the dwelling due to its width and depth. The extension would be stilted, to allow access underneath, which would be off-centred from the first-floor element.
7. The extension would be conspicuous from the road because of its scale, width and land level changes. The development would not respect the proportions nor the roof form of the host dwelling and would unbalance both the host dwelling and the symmetry of the semi-detached dwellings. This is because of its stilted design, width and hipped roof. Consequently, the scheme would result in an incongruous addition to the surrounding area due to its width, scale, off-centre stilted design, hipped roof and the topography of the area.
8. For the reasons given above, the extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policy CS10 of the Council's Local Development Framework: Core Strategy (2009) (CS) and Policies D9 and D10 of the Council's Local Development Framework: Development Policies Document (2009) (DPD). These Policies seek, amongst other matters, to promote good design and ensure proposals respect, and where appropriate enhance the character of the locality.
9. It would also not comply with the Framework and guidance contained within the Council's Residential Design Guide Part 2: Guidance for Householders Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (RDG). These seek, amongst other matters, to promote good design and require new development to be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Living Conditions

10. The proposed extension would be adjacent to the side elevation of No 40. The side elevation of No 40 contains a number of windows. These windows would face the extension. I understand that the scheme has been revised to overcome the neighbour's concerns.
11. The proposal would not result in significant overlooking. However, given the limited gap between No 40's side elevation windows and the extension, the proposal would result in the outlook of these windows being dominated by the scheme. Based on the evidence submitted, it would have an overbearing impact upon the occupiers of No 40 and would result in an oppressive form of development which would create a claustrophobic feeling.
12. For those reasons, the proposal would adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of No 40, having regard to outlook. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policy CS10 of the CS and Policies D9 and D10 of the DPD. These Policies seek, amongst other matters, to ensure proposals have no significant detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents.
13. It would also conflict with the Framework and the RDG which promote good design and require new development to provide a high standard of amenity for existing users.

Other Matters

14. The appellant highlights that the Council has granted planning permission for similar extensions nearby¹ and have approved developments with 1 metre between dwellings. However, they have provided extremely limited information regarding those approvals. Based on the evidence before me, these applications relate to different roads where the site context differ to the appeal site and the extensions within Park Avenue are in keeping. In any event, each application and appeal must be considered on its own merits.
15. The appellant states that national government policy is promoting larger home extensions and increase in height with reduced local planning department involvement. In addition, the pandemic has resulted in an upsurge in home extensions. Nonetheless, these are not considerations which outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

L M Wilson

INSPECTOR

¹ Including 19/02036/FUL and 18/01273/FUL