The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2022 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPl MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/22/3297342
136 Horbury Road, Wakefield, WF2 8BQ

- 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 Shakeez Aslam against the decision of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
- The application Ref 21/02879/FUL, dated 20 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2022.
- The development proposed is two storey side extension and single storey side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of the proposed development has been taken from the planning application form, removing the words 'retention of', since that is not a form of development.

4. A two-storey side extension was previously granted planning permission (Reference 19/00530/FUL) and has been built. However, it has not been constructed in accordance with the approved plans, with particular regard to the increase in the ridge height of the roof and the size and position of the window openings. The appeal proposal seeks permission for the extension as constructed, together with a proposed garage. It is therefore partly retrospective, and I have assessed it on that basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling set back from the highway on a main road. There are several semi-detached properties of similar design and appearance in terms of height and width to either side of the appeal property, with regular spaces separating the pairs of dwellings. These factors contribute

positively to the character and appearance of this part of Horbury Road and create a rhythm and a degree of uniformity in the street scene.

7. The two-storey side extension is set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling and it has the same ridge height as the dwelling. It has two first floor windows and a single ground floor window towards the centre of the front elevation.

8. Whilst the use of the accommodation created in the roof space is not a matter for this appeal, the ridgeline of the extension at the same height as the host property means that it does not appear as a subservient extension to the dwelling.

9. The scale and position of the windows are at odds with the general arrangement of the host dwelling's windows and those of nearby properties and the resulting appearance is incongruous with the character and appearance of the area. Whilst I note that the appellant argues that smaller windows are more energy efficient and help to reduce heat loss, there is no evidence before me of the sustainability credentials of the new windows and therefore this is a matter to which I can give very limited weight in my assessment of the appeal.

10. The proposed single storey garage extension would significantly reduce the gap between the host dwelling and No 134a Horbury Road. In addition, the combined width of the side extensions would be wider than the host dwelling, unbalancing its appearance with the adjoining dwelling which would be harmful to the regular character of the semi-detached pairs in the street scene.

11. I acknowledge that the extensions would provide additional storage space and secure parking for the appellant, but these considerations would not outweigh the harm identified above.

12. I conclude that the two-storey side extension and single storey garage extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The development would therefore conflict with Policies D9 and D10 of the Wakefield Local Development Framework Development Policies (2009) and with Policy CS10 of the Wakefield Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2009) which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development respects the character and scale of the building and enhances the local character. The appeal proposal would also conflict with the guidance in the Residential Design Guide which seeks to ensure that extensions are not visually dominant to the original house.

Other Matters

13. Regardless of the circumstances that led to the variations in the extension from the approved plans, they do not mitigate the harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

14. On the site visit, I saw examples of dwellings with garages, although they were mainly set back in the rear garden areas and accessed via a driveway from the main road, not attached to the side of the dwelling. They are therefore not directly comparable to the proposal before me. In any event, I have determined this appeal on the site-specific circumstances of this case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan, read as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR