



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2024

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/23/3330977
53 Stanley Road, Wakefield WF1 4NA

- 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 Phillip Fletcher against the decision of Wakefield Council.
 - The application Ref: 23/00963/FUL dated 18 May 2023 was refused by notice dated 19 July 2023.
 - The application is for single storey extension to front. Two storey extension to rear. Loft conversion with dormers to front and side/rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the determination of this application a revised National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published in December 2023. I have therefore determined this appeal in accordance with the revised provisions within the Framework.

Main Issues

3. The Council included five reasons for refusal within their decision notice and the main issues are concerned with the following: i) The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area, ii) The effect of the proposals upon the living conditions of neighbours. iii) The effect of the proposal upon the safe and efficient use of the highway and iv) whether the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a mid terrace house fronting onto the busy Stanley Road which is a major route into Wakefield. The property itself is located near to the corner of Earl Street where it appears much residents parking is to be obtained. The site is part of a wider area of terrace properties typical of late 19th century urban expansion with most properties being through terraces with 2 storey outshot extensions to the rears. To the front the property has a single bay window and front door facing onto a small yard and garden area which is much the same as most other properties within the row.
5. The majority of the proposals concern modifications to the rear of the property where there is currently a part single, part two storey hipped outshot building

- containing kitchen to the ground floor and bathroom and utility room to the first floor. The rest of the property seemingly consists of living rooms and bedrooms.
6. To the rear the property has footway access to a rear enclosed yard that leads into the rears of adjoining properties. The neighbouring property to the corner of Earl Street has seemingly extended to some extent through extending their outshut to two storeys and as such the northern elevation of this rear yard is backed by a high wall that serves the rear of this extension and that extends to the ridge of the neighbours pitched roof here.
 7. The proposal before me seeks permission to somewhat reflect this adjacent extension, as far as it concerns the rear outshut. This would build upon the ground floor element of the original house and extend the whole outshut to two storey's for its full length so as to accommodate an extra bedroom at first floor level. Further to this, the proposal would construct two sizeable flat roof box dormers to both the rear roof slope of the existing house and the new roof slope of the proposed outshut. This would be supplemented by a new pitched roof dormer and large porch to the front elevation of the property. In total this would create a further three bedrooms.
 8. In assessing this scheme I am aware of the Council's policies D9, D10 of the Wakefield Site Specific Policies Local Plan (SSPLP) and Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy (CS) which seek to reflect The Framework in their desire to achieve high quality new developments, extensions and places that are of good design that protect the living conditions of neighbours. Similarly I am aware of the guidance and recommendations within the Council's Residential Design Guide (RDG) which reflects this on a local scale, as well as Policy D14 which seeks to protect the safe and efficient use of the highway.
 9. The scheme before me would fairly dramatically increase the amount of development upon what is quite a modest site within a very tight knit residential area. This would involve not only the extension of a further length of two storey outshut to the rear, but would also effectively be creating something tantamount to a three storey property through the use of very large, flat roof dormers.
 10. The rear extension itself currently contains a hipped roof and I consider that this may well have been intentional to protect the rear amenity space associated with other properties on Earl Street. The proposed first floor extension here would alter this hip to a half gable and would increase the amount of development adjacent to number 35 Earl Street. Whilst not extending much beyond the rear elevation line of this property, I consider that there would be some harmful enclosure and overdominance caused by this course of action that would seriously affect the living conditions of occupants at number 35 as a result.
 11. The proposal would also introduce highly dominant and poorly designed dormer features into the area that would significantly exceed the accepted size of dormer extensions within the RDG. As a result, the proposed dormers to the side of the extended outshut and to the rear roof slope of the existing house would lead to this proposal being highly dominant upon the rear area of houses as well as appearing oppressive when seen from adjacent neighbouring properties. There would also be the added impact of a notable increase in

- overlooking and overshadowing between properties that would occur as a result.
12. As such of these rear extensions therefore I consider that there would be significant and noticeable harm both to the character and appearance of the streetscene here as well as upon the living conditions of neighbours and that an overdevelopment of this property would likely occur as a result.
 13. Coming to the front elevation, the proposal would introduce a more modest dormer extension along with a full width front, ground floor extension. This front extension would largely usurp the dominance of the existing hexagonal bay window which I consider is a positive architectural feature to the front onto Stanley Road. As such an important characteristic of the streetscene here would be lost through this front extension and the general rhythm and design quality of the street would be harmed as a result. The dormer itself, although pitched roof and largely in accordance with the RDG would not retain much roof space above the eaves. As such, I consider that the dormer would still appear dominant and of a poor design being so prominent upon this principal frontage.
 14. Ultimately the proposals before me would not only result in a significant overdevelopment of the plot, but the architectural elements proposed to accommodate such development would be of a very poor design and would cause considerable harm to the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of neighbours. As such these proposals represent a clear and direct conflict with Policies D9 and D10 of the SSPLP as well as the RDG.
 15. Coming to the matters of highway safety, the main issue would appear to be the balance between adding extra bedrooms to that of safe and accessible parking to serve the property. Even whilst considering the sustainable location of the existing house, and the young age of residents who would occupy the additional bedrooms, I must concur with the Council that the amount of added bedrooms still has the potential to place much greater demand upon local parking areas, especially those along Earl Street. As such I consider that there could well be a harmful effect of more vehicles using these tightly enclosed streets for circulation as they search for available spaces. As a result this would cause some harm to the safe and efficient use of the highway and would conflict with Policy D14 of the SSPLP.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I hereby dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR