



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2023

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/23/3331865

17 Dovecote Close, Horbury, Wakefield WF4 6DH

- 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 Charlie Welch against the decision of the Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01238/FUL, dated 27 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion, raising the ridge line and second storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council changed the description of development from that stated on the application form in the interests of clarity. I consider that the amended description accurately describes the appeal scheme and accordingly I have adopted an amended description in the heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area in general.

Reasons

4. The site is in a predominantly residential area at the head of a cul-de-sac. The property is a linked detached house, joined to the adjacent property via single storey flat roof garages of each property.
5. The increase in roof height and front rooflights would differentiate the property from the adjoining one however given the existing gap separating the main bulk of the property from the adjoining property the increased height and the rooflights would not appear incongruous. I observed during my site visit the change in level of the properties at the head of the cul-de-sac creates a difference in the overall height of properties. On this basis the increase in roof height would not be out of keeping with the area.
6. The Council's Residential Design Guide Part 2: Guidance for Householders, Supplementary Planning Document (2018) highlights that rear dormer should

be set down from the ridge of the roof, set in from the sides and positioned well in relation to the windows on the lower levels.

7. The proposed dormer would be set down from the increased roof height and in from the sides of the roof. Nevertheless, the large scale windows would be set straight above the eaves. The rear dormer would not be well positioned in relation to the lower windows and would be a substantial and dominant addition to the property which would be disproportionate to the built form of the existing property.
8. Given the elevated position of the appeal site the proposed rear dormer would be visible to a degree from Hall Cliffe Road, the substantial bulk and design of the dormer would be incongruous to the character and appearance of the area in general.
9. My attention has been drawn by the Appellant to dormer extensions within the area which are heavily glazed. Notwithstanding this each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.
10. I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area in general. There is conflict with Policy CS10 of the Local Development Framework, Core Strategy (2009) and Policies D9 and D10 of the City of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council Local Development Framework, Development Policies Document (2009) which seeks amongst other things are high quality which positively contribute to the local area, respecting the character and scale of the dwelling, and its location.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR