



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2022

by H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/22/3304225

7 Mill Chase Croft, Wakefield, West Yorkshire WF2 9SJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Tabasam Riaz against the decision of Wakefield Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00957/ADS, dated 20 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as “an additional storey to form bedroom accommodation all materials to match existing.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse consisting of up to two additional storeys, where the existing dwellinghouse consists of two or more storeys, subject to limitations and conditions.
3. Amongst these conditions, paragraph AA.2(3) to Part 1 requires the developer to apply to the local planning authority for prior approval to assess the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of any adjoining premises, the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, air traffic and defence assets, and protected views identified in the Directions Relating to Protected Vistas.

Main Issue

4. The Council refused the application for prior approval on grounds relating to the effects of the proposal on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.
5. The main issue is therefore whether prior approval should be granted under Class AA of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the GPDO, having particular regard to the effect of the proposal on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

Reasons

6. Mill Chase Croft is a cul-de-sac located within a larger residential development. Within this residential development there is a cohesion to the appearance of the properties owing to it containing a set range of house types and the houses sharing distinctive design elements. 7 Mill Chase Croft is located on the end of a short row of 4 terraced properties. The terrace has a balanced appearance as

a result of the mid-terrace properties being one house type of the same appearance and the two end terraces being a second housetype of the same appearance. Each of the properties within the terrace are 2 storeys in height as are the remaining houses on the cul-de-sac. The degree of design cohesion and consistency in the appearance of the street scenes within the residential development positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.

7. No 7 is adjacent to Henry Street. On this street, and closest to the site, there are a significant number of older, traditionally designed two storey terraced properties of a similar design and arranged in a uniform manner.
8. As referenced by the appellant, the conditions contained within AA.2(3) to Part 1 of the GPDO require the effects of the development upon the external appearance of the dwellinghouse to be assessed. However, the broader effects that the altered external appearance may have upon the street scene are relevant matters to be considered given that such effects are so intrinsically linked to the alterations proposed to the house itself. Therefore, in my decision, I have assessed not only the precise design and architectural detailing of the extended house proposed, but the effects that would be brought about by the extended property to the character and appearance of the area.
9. The additional storey proposed would unbalance the existing symmetry exhibited within the terrace and make the host property appear anomalous. The increased height of the host property would appear abrupt and jar with the consistent 2 storey heights of the neighbouring properties on both Mill Chase Croft and Henry Street. The host property is orientated such that its side elevation is closest to Henry Street. In views along Henry Street this amplifies the prominence of its feature gable ended design and roof apex. At the 3 storeys proposed, the property would appear particularly tall and prominent.
10. Consequently, the development would represent an unsympathetic enlargement of the host property, which would be harmful to the external appearance of the dwelling and the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

H Jones

INSPECTOR