



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2022

by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/21/3286013

29 Addison Avenue, Normanton, WF6 1PF

- 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 Grant Green against the decision of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01202/FUL, dated 1 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is Two storey side extension, single storey front projection, single storey rear extension (part retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. At my site visit, that part of the rear extension behind the existing dwelling had been constructed, apart from internal finishing works and the side and front extensions were under construction. The appeal proposal is therefore partly retrospective and I have assessed it on that basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are:
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, having particular regard to the Addison Avenue street scene; and
 - The effect on the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers at No 31 Addison Avenue (No 31) having particular regard to levels of daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located within a residential area to the south of Normanton. The regular layout of the narrow access roads and the position of the semi-detached pairs set back from the road behind low fences create an open and established street scene. The semi-detached pairs on the east side of Addison Avenue which include the appeal property are simple in form with one ground floor and two first floor windows in their front elevations, with their main entrance in the side elevation, which contributes to their modest and unassuming character and appearance. The

- similarity in the form, materials and pattern of door and window openings in the dwellings along the road creates a cohesive and uniform street scene.
5. The appeal property occupies a generously sized plot, close to the junction of Addison Avenue with Snydale Road. I consider that there would be sufficient space between the rear and side of the extension and the north and east boundaries of the site so that the extension would not appear unduly cramped on the plot.
 6. The Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD) requires that extensions should be of a subordinate design which allows the original building to remain dominant in terms of its massing, height and position. The SPD states that side extensions should not be visually dominant in relation to the original house.
 7. The front wall of the two storey side extension would be slightly set back from the dwelling's existing first floor wall and would be set down from the ridge. Its hipped roof form would reflect the existing roof. However, due to its height and width, the two storey side extension would be a bulky structure which would add considerable mass and bulk to the existing dwelling. The roof ridge would be double the length of the existing ridge. Overall, the two storey side extension would be a disproportionate addition and would not be subordinate in scale to the host dwelling as required by the SPD.
 8. The front lean-to would span the full width of the dwelling, creating an unduly horizontal emphasis which would be exacerbated by the horizontal proportions of the window openings. The rear lean-to would similarly extend across the full width of the existing dwelling and the side extension, resulting in an elongated and horizontal feature which would be at odds with the modest proportions of the existing dwelling. Although the rear elevation would not be visible from public vantage points, this does not negate the need for good design which pays due regard to the form, scale and proportions of the existing dwelling.
 9. Overall, the scheme would be an excessive addition to the dwelling, which would be harmful to its existing modest character and appearance. It would have an unduly dominant and conspicuous appearance which would draw the eye and would cause material harm to the unity and cohesive character of the street scene.
 10. I saw at my site visit that there are two storey side extensions at Nos 13, 16 and 33 Addison Avenue. However, these are subordinate in scale and appearance to the host dwelling. Although No 16 also has a small porch extension to the front, there are no other front extensions in the street scene. The extension at No 19 Addison Avenue which has been referred to me by the appellant is single storey and to the rear of the dwelling. As such, the circumstances of the other extensions that have taken place on properties in the road are different from the appeal scheme before me.
 11. The proposal would be contrary to Policy CS10 of the Wakefield Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2009) (CS) and Policies D9 and D10 of the Development Policies document (2009) (DP) in so far as they require high quality design for new development and also that extensions should respect the character and scale of the dwelling and its location and should not cause harm to the character of the area. There would also be conflict with the advice in the SPD and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the

Framework) to secure high quality design as a key aspect of sustainable development and ensure that proposals add to the overall quality of an area.

Living conditions

12. No 31 has a ground floor entrance door, glazed patio doors and one first floor window in its rear elevation. Due to its single storey height, lean-to roof form and restricted length, the proposed rear extension would not cause a material reduction in levels of daylight reaching No 31's rear patio doors and first floor window. Those rooms would continue to receive adequate levels of daylight and a satisfactory outlook would be maintained.
13. The appeal property's rear extension would cast additional shadow over a small area outside No 31's patio doors. However, there would be no reduction in levels of sunlight reaching the rest of No 31's rear garden. Due to its orientation slightly to the north-west of No 31, any additional shadow cast by the extension would be confined to the evening hours when the appeal property and No 31 itself will already cast some shadow over the area outside the patio doors. Overall, I conclude that the proposed rear extension would not cause a significant reduction in the levels of sunlight reaching No 31's rear garden and windows.
14. Whilst I note that the rear extension would not comply with the 45 degree guidance set out in the SPD, each case must be considered on its merits and based on the circumstances of the site. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the development would not cause material harm to the living conditions of No 31's occupiers having regard to levels of daylight and sunlight. The proposal would comply with DP Policies D9 and D10 in so far as they seek to ensure that development does not have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbours. The provisions of the Framework to require a high standard of amenity for existing and future users would also be met.

Other Matters

15. I note that the extension is required to accommodate the appellant's extended family, however these are personal circumstances which can change over time and the development would remain long after such circumstances have ceased to be relevant. Accordingly this has limited weight in the overall planning balance.

Conclusion

16. Whilst I have concluded that the appeal scheme would not cause harm to the living conditions of No 31's occupiers, this does not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Addison Avenue street scene. There are no material considerations in this case of sufficient weight to outweigh that harm and the conflict with the development plan, read as a whole.
17. For the reasons outlined above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR