



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2022

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7TH March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/21/3288550

2 Castle Terrace, Wakefield WF2 6AZ

- 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 Dr Indira Kasibhatla against the decision of City of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00907/FUL, dated 4 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is extension over existing garage to include new dormers and balcony to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to extension over existing garage to include new dormers. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to balcony to rear and planning permission is granted for balcony to rear at 2 Castle Terrace, Wakefield WF2 6AZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00907/FUL, dated 4 April 2021, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; Block Plan; Existing Floor Plans/Front Elevation; Proposed First Floor Plan/Proposed Front Elevation/Existing Rear Elevation; and Proposed Rear and Side Elevations/Existing Side Elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by an amended version on the decision notice and in subsequent appeal documents. I consider that subsequent description to accurately represent the proposal and I have therefore used it within this decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscape.

Reasons

4. The proposed extension would project to the front of the main building and would include a roof extending to the ridge of the main roof of the dwelling. The flank wall of the extension would also project above the eaves of the front elevation of the dwelling. Even allowing for the existing attached garage, the proposed extension would appear as an overdominant and obtrusive feature projecting to the front of the building in a location which is readily visible within the streetscape.
5. The proposed dormer windows would be tile-hung and have pitched roofs, which the appellant indicates was requested by the Council. There are also other dwellings in the area which have dormer windows. However, the number and design of the dormers, including their extent between the eaves and the ridge of the roof, would not reflect the appearance of the main building and other dwellings in the area, and would give the roof of the extension an incongruous and cluttered appearance. This would add to the harm arising from the scale and design of the extension in this prominent location.
6. The area contains buildings of a variety of designs and scale. However, even within this varied context, the proposed extension would appear as an obtrusive feature in views of the existing dwelling and nearby properties.
7. The balcony to the rear would extend across the full width of the main rear elevation of the building at first floor level. However, it would be a lightweight structure with a limited projection. It would not be readily visible from the public realm, and due to its lightweight appearance and scale it would not be unduly intrusive in views from neighbouring properties. On that basis, the balcony would not be harmful in respect of character and appearance.
8. Notwithstanding my conclusions in respect of the balcony, I conclude that the proposed extension would, due to its design and scale, lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscape. The extension would therefore be contrary to Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy 2009 as well as Policies D9 and D10 of the Development Policies Document 2009 which together require high quality design for new development, that extensions should respect the character and scale of the dwelling, and should not cause harm to the character of the area, amongst other things. The extension would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework with regards to achieving well-designed places.
9. The extension would also be contrary to the advice of the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2018 which sets out that extensions should be subordinate to the original house.

Other Matters

10. The balcony could lead to elevated views of neighbouring residential properties. However, an existing side and rear extension would provide significant screening of views of the property to the north, and this would be further mitigated by the set-back from the site boundary. The proposed balcony would also enable elevated views in relatively close proximity to the boundary with the dwelling to the south. However, this would primarily be of a driveway leading to a garage, and the latter would provide a significant degree of screening of the rear garden of the neighbouring property. Although there are

windows to the side of the dwelling to the south, due to the relative arrangement of the buildings the proposed balcony would not enable unacceptably intrusive views into the neighbouring dwelling. Due to the topography of the area, I also saw that elevated views of the property to the south were enabled by an existing patio area to the rear of the appeal site.

11. On the basis of the screening provided by existing buildings, the nature of views provided by the existing site, and the limited projection of the balcony, the proposal would not lead to a degree of overlooking which would lead to unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents with regards to privacy. This reflects the conclusions of the Council on this matter.
12. I am mindful of the appellant's intention to provide improved accommodation for their family. However, this private benefit would not be sufficient to outweigh the significant harm that I have identified in respect of character and appearance.
13. In support of the appeal, the appellant refers to development approved in the vicinity of the site. However, I have not been provided with sufficient details on these schemes to determine if they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal, which I have in any event determined on its own merits.

Conclusion

14. I have concluded that the proposed extension over existing garage to include new dormers would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscape. However, I have also concluded that the proposed balcony to the rear would not lead to significant harm in respect of character and appearance or the living conditions of neighbouring residents.
15. The proposed balcony would be physically and functionally divisible from the remainder of the proposal. I shall therefore issue a split decision to allow the appeal in relation to the balcony, but dismiss it in relation to the other elements of the proposal.
16. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty. A condition is also required to ensure that external materials match those of the existing building in the interests of character and appearance.

David Cross

INSPECTOR