



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2023

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/22/3310245

12 Cyprus Street, Wakefield WF1 2RW

- 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 Atif Ali against the decision of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01337/FUL, dated 20 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing detached garage and outbuilding and proposed new detached garage with gym above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached property with a detached, flat roofed double garage on Cyprus Street. The area comprises dwellings of varying design and appearance. Nevertheless, properties are set back from the road by front gardens and there are predominantly clear spaces in-between properties, created by driveways to the side and modest single story flat roofed garages. The similarity in the general scale of the built form and spaces around the properties create a spacious character and a sense of place, which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposal would introduce a detached garage with a gable end in a prominent location opposite the junction with Lonsdale Road. It would be set back from the primary elevation offering an element of subservience to the main dwelling. A generous set back from the footpath would also remain. However, the proposed development would fill almost entirely the space to the side of the property, bringing development in close proximity to the main dwelling. It would therefore appear as a dominant development, eroding the existing spaciousness at the site.
5. The proposed development would have materials to match the existing main dwelling, which would contribute to the garage having a domestic appearance. Even if views across the vacant plot adjacent to the appeal site over the rear gardens of Cyprus Street and Cyprus Avenue would remain, the proposal would be prominent in the townscape on approach from Lonsdale Road, terminating

the view. It would result in an incongruous addition that would not relate positively to the spacious character of the area.

6. It is indicated that a previous permission at the site for another detached garage could be implemented, and this is a fallback position. While of a similar height, the approved scheme differs from the appeal scheme. It is not as wide and so does not narrow the gap between the garage and the main dwelling to the same extent as the appeal scheme would. The approved development has not been found to cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and accords with the development plan. Consequently, I find the suggested fallback position to have limited weight in the determination of the appeal.
7. Accordingly, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with Policy CS10 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2009) and policies D9 and D10 of the Local Development Framework Development Policies (2009). These policies, amongst other things, seek new development that incorporates high quality design, which is appropriate to its location, protecting, enhancing and contributing positively to local character.
8. It is contrary to the guidance set out in the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2018) and Street Design Guide SPD (2012) which advise that garages and outbuildings must respect the physical character of the main dwelling, and that development should suit the character of the street. The proposal would also be contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 130 in relation to achieving well designed places.

Conclusion

9. My above findings bring the development into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that have been shown to have sufficient weight to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR