



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2022

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27TH July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/22/3291904
43 Hunt Street, CASTLEFORD, WF10 2LR

- 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 Paul Jordan against the decision of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02383/FUL, dated 23 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a first-floor rear extension and a loft conversion involving the creation of a dormer to the rear and roof-lights to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a first-floor rear extension and a loft conversion involving the creation of a dormer to the rear and roof-lights to the front at 43 Hunt Street, CASTLEFORD, WF10 2LR, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/02383/FUL, dated 23 September 2021, and the plans submitted with it, 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: RM002-01; RM002-02
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the rear extension and dormer window on the character and appearance of the area around Hunt Street.

Reasons

3. No 43 is a mid-terraced house situated on the northern side of Hunt Street. Hunt Street is characterised by rows of terraced houses which front directly onto the street. The houses have relatively long rear yards and there are wide back lanes between the houses on Hunt Street and those of William Street and Mill Lane, the adjoining streets to the north and south. These three roads form the basis of a community of small terraced houses to the west of Lock Lane. Many, including the appeal property, have single-storey rear extensions, and some have two-storey rear extensions.

4. The proposed development would involve the construction of a small first-floor rear extension, some 2.3 metres in depth, above part of the existing ground-floor extension. It would also involve the construction of a rear dormer window across much of the rear roof slope. Both the rear extension and the dormer would have flat roofs. The rear elevations of houses on Hunt Street are visible from 'connecting' roads and the back lanes in the area.
5. Policy D9 of the Council's Development Policies Document (DPD) indicates that development should respect and, where appropriate, enhance the character of the locality in terms of design, scale, massing, height, layout, materials and colour. Policy D10 of the DPD indicates that extensions and alterations to dwellings should respect residential amenity, the character and scale of the dwelling, and its location. They should not be discordant with the style of the original dwelling or result in significant harm to the character of the area.
6. The Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) indicates that care must be taken with design and detailing of rear extensions to ensure that they do not detract from the original house. Rear extensions to terraced houses can extend to the edges of the shared boundary subject to party wall agreements. With regard to dormers, the SPD indicates that if dormer windows are not common in an area, any part of the dormer that can be seen from the street should not have a negative effect on the property or the street scene.
7. The Council contends that the proposed first floor rear extension with the dormer to the rear would by virtue of its design, scale and appearance result in a development that would be out of character with the terraced row of properties, resulting in significant harm to the appearance of the host property and the visual amenity of the local area.
8. The appellant contends that other examples of two-storey or first-floor rear extensions are evident on Hunt Street and adjoining streets, and that the proposal would not, therefore be out of character.
9. The area around Hunt Street contains a number of rows of small terraced houses, which are of very similar design and appearance. Whilst there are few that have two-storey rear extensions, there are some examples, and I do not consider that they appear significantly harmful to the character of the area. The proposed first-floor extension at the appeal property would be relatively small at 2.3 metres in depth. The significant space between the rear elevations of the rows of houses in the area gives the area an open feel, and the limited scale of the extension would not result in detriment to this character. Moreover, the flat roof, in this case, would minimise its apparent scale and would reflect the flat roofs visible on other mid-terraced houses in the area.
10. There are few dormer extensions anywhere in the immediate surroundings, though there are examples visible at the rear of Lock Lane and Mill Lane. Given the limited width of the houses on Hunt Street, it would be difficult for a dormer to be constructed in any other way than across much of the roof slope, as would be the case at No 43. However, in this case, the scale of the dormer would reflect the general scale of the property, and views of its side cheeks would, in any case, be partly obscured by the chimneys on either side. Although it would be one of very few in the vicinity, I do not consider that it would be significantly harmful to the character or appearance of the surrounding area.

11. In conclusion, I find that the proposed development would not be significantly harmful to the character or appearance of the wider area around Hunt Street, and that it would, on this basis, not be harmful to policies D9 or D10 of the DPD or to guidance in the SPD. Accordingly, I allow this appeal.

Conditions

12. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR