



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2022

by Richard Newsome BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/21/3283630

4 Roger Drive, Sandal, Wakefield WF2 7NE

- 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 Simon Juniper against the decision of Wakefield Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01908/FUL, dated 19 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a detached two storey dwelling set back from and facing the road. It is part of a group of very similar hipped roof dwellings with feature front facing gables and bay windows. A single storey subservient side section is a former garage which has been converted into living space. The set back and spacing of the dwellings, along with their design, scale and appearance brings a pleasant homogeneity to the immediate street scene that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The extension would be of a substantial scale, extending across and in front of the existing single storey section. This, the span of the resulting roof, and the use of a new and wide feature gable to the front would combine to visually dominate the existing dwelling and jar with the uniformity of the design and spacing of the immediate street scene.
5. It would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area and thus conflict with Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy (2009), Policies D9 and D10 of the Local Development Framework Development Policies Document (2009), and the Residential Design Guide (2018) (the RDG). It would also conflict with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Taken together, and amongst other things, these policies and guidance require that, extensions specifically, should be of a high quality, respect and be sympathetic to the character and scale of the dwelling and its locality.

Other Matters

6. There are other examples of two storey side extensions locally. I am not aware of the circumstances of the planning permissions granted therefore and I understand some were approved prior to the adoption of the current RDG. In any case, they do not form part of the group of buildings I have mentioned above. Each development proposal is considered on its own merits. As such, I am not led to allowing the appeal.
7. The RDG is clear in that it expects extensions to be set back from the frontages and set down from the existing roofs of dwellings. It does allow for deviations but where that is to be the case a clear justification is required. However, I do not see a sufficiently clear justification for the design or scale of the proposed development.
8. There are local examples where bricks used in extensions have related poorly to their host dwelling. For this reason, I understand the Council's concern that the use of non-matching bricks in the case of the appeal scheme would not be acceptable. I see that the quarry the bricks of the existing dwelling came from has closed and an exact match would not be possible. That said, it would not be beyond the realms of possibility to find either a close match or indeed a suitable alternative treatment to give an acceptable visual result. Even so, this would not overcome the harm that the scale or design of the proposals would cause in the terms I have described.
9. There have not been any objections to the proposals from neighbours. However, this is a neutral matter and would not in any case absolve me from making an assessment as to its impacts in planning terms.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Newsome

INSPECTOR