

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2022

by S Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/22/3301505

12 Pasture Way, Castleford WF10 5TN

- 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 Martin Greatbatch against the decision of Wakefield Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/00175/FUL, dated 15 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor extension to existing detached garage and two storey link extension to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property falls within part of a modern housing estate of mainly large brick built detached dwellings set within spacious plots. While the dwellings do vary in terms of appearance, there is nevertheless a pleasing consistency to the pattern of development in this part of Pasture Way in so far that those dwellings that face directly onto this road are set well back into the plots and within shared driveways/turning spaces and, in the main, with single storey detached garages positioned close to the highway edge with hipped roofs. The hipped roofed garages appear subservient in scale to the main dwellings and given their height and scale do not have an imposing or dominating impact when viewed from the street-scene. Collectively, the above attributes add positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The evidence is that planning permission has already been approved to use the detached garage as a gym. However, the appeal proposal would significantly increase the height of the existing detached garage in so far that it would include the provision of a first-floor extension with a gabled roof. It is proposed that a two-storey linked extension would connect the aforementioned development to the front of the main house.

5. I find that, owing to its bulk, height and position, the development would appear as a dominant and out of proportion addition to the host property. When appreciated by passers-by in this part of Pasture Way, it would unacceptably contrast with the mainly lower scale of development positioned close to the main road, would add considerable bulk to the host property, and would unacceptably enclose the space around the two detached dwellings that share the common turning area. The use of a gabled roof over the garage would exacerbate the dominant impact. Given the height and bulk of the development, coupled with the absence of a hipped roof, the proposal would appear discordant in the street-scene.
6. I recognise that No 20 Pasture Way does include an imposing and front facing linked extension up to the main road. However, this is the exception rather than the norm in this area and, furthermore, it does have a hipped roof and so this lessens its impact. I do accept the appellant's comment that there are other parts of Pasture Way where gabled roofs to garages exist. However, hipped garage roofs are more noticeable within the vicinity of the appeal site. Furthermore, the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area is not solely related to the absence of a hipped roof.
7. For the collective reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would not accord with the design, character and appearance requirements of policies D9(a) and D10(d) of the Council's Local Development Framework Development Policies 2009.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development would not accord with the development plan for the area taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

S Hartley

INSPECTOR