



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2023

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/23/3326286

12 Elmwood Drive, Walton, Wakefield WF2 6LW

- 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 Ben Plummer against the decision of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01997/FUL, dated 25 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension with double dormers to each roof slope, internal alterations and new render finish to all elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Elmwood Drive is a residential street mainly comprising a variety of two storey dwellings and bungalows. The appeal property has a steeply pitched roof, with its gable facing the road. Whilst there are examples of other similar properties where dormer alterations have been made, the appeal dwelling is situated within a straight row of similar gable fronted properties at Elmwood Drive, which predominantly retain the original gable fronted and unaltered pitched roof forms. There is also a smaller row of similar properties on the opposing side of Elmwood Drive. Most of these also retain their original character. The uniformity and space around these properties makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The Wakefield Residential Design Guide for Part 2: Householders Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD) is guidance and is to be flexible in its interpretation. However, it aims to encourage high quality design. It includes amongst other things that where flat roof dormer windows are

- provided, they should be set down from the ridge, up from the eaves and in from the sides.
6. The proposed development would introduce flat roof dormers on both sides of the roof to create the additional bed and bathrooms at first floor. Even accounting for their position set down from the ridge, the dormers would be set close to the eaves. Due to their length they would occupy a large proportion of the existing and proposed new roof on both sides. The Council has advised that the dormers would only be set in from the side of the roof by 0.25m, which is a not disputed by the appellant, but a small distance in comparison the overall bulk of the dormer windows.
 7. Although meeting the requirements of the SPD, this would make them appear very prominent on the dwelling. The overall contrasting flat roof, scale and the position on most of the full width of each roof plane would mean that individually the dormers would appear as bulky additions, and together they would fail to be proportionate to it and dominate the host dwelling. Furthermore the development would also fail to harmonise with the prevalent shared characteristics of the row of dwellings that the appeal dwelling sits within, on both sides of the road. In this respect such large development would appear more incongruous here.
 8. My attention has been drawn to the full extent of the dormer windows not being seen together in all views. Nonetheless due to the limited set back from the front gable it would be possible to discern that there would be dormers on both sides of the dwelling. The spacious gaps between the dwellings does allow for full views of the roof planes down the side of properties, and the full length of each individual dormer would be visible from the streetscene, neighbouring properties and gardens. Both dormers would be highly visible when facing towards the front elevation of the dwelling from Elmwood Drive.
 9. From my site visit it was evident that properties in the area have been extended in a variety of styles. Dormer windows are already prevalent in the streetscene and surrounding area. It is a matter of opinion whether these are successfully integrated into the street scene, however Nos 2 and 19 Elmwood Drive in particular, occupy a similar position in the street as the appeal property. They are however, both different with neither appearing as long or as wide. No 2 Elmwood Drive has a significant set back from the Elmwood Drive side of the roof and No 19 has a catslide design. Although there are clearly other dormers in the area, which I have taken into account, as the proposal before me is of such a scale, the dormer windows would be obtrusive additions
 10. The dormer windows would have a harmful effect on the host building and character and appearance of the area. Consequently, in that regard, the proposal would be contrary to Policies D9 and D10 of the Wakefield Local Development Framework Development Policies Document 2009. The proposal would also not fulfil the requirements of paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to ensure development will add to the quality of the area. For similar reasons, the proposal would conflict with the aims of the SPD.

Other Matters

11. The Council has not raised concerns about the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of the residents of other nearby properties,

the principle of extending the property, the appearance of the Juliet balcony or the render. I have no reason to take a different view. Therefore while there might be compliance with the Council's policies and the National Planning Policy Framework here, these matters weigh neither for nor against the proposed development.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, the proposal does not accord with the development plan when read as a whole. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR

