



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 March 2024

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/23/3335052

25 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 Muazzam Baig against the decision of Wakefield Council.
 - The application 23/01615/FUL, dated 23 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is installation of external wall insulation with render finish (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Wakefield Local Plan 2036, Volume 1 Development Strategy, Strategic and Local Policies was adopted in January 2024. Policies SP23, LP56 and LP57 of that plan replace Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy (2009) and Policies D9 and D10 of the Development Policies Document (2009) referred to in the Council's decision notice. These are general design, character and environmental quality policies and, as there has been no substantive change, it is not necessary to seek the views of the main parties on them. I have, however, assessed the proposals against the policies of the new Wakefield Local Plan 2036.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the external wall insulation with render finish on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider terrace.

Reasons

4. No.25 Stanley Road (No.25) is a two-storey mid-terrace dwelling located on the west side of Stanley Road. No.25 was originally constructed of red brick with feature grey stone heads and cills above the front door, upper windows and front square bay window; characteristics that No.25 shared with its immediate neighbour at No.23 Stanley Road.
5. To the front and rear elevation of No.25, 900mm EPS external wall insulation boards have been installed, with a render finish painted a dark grey colour.
6. I observed on my site visit that the depth of the external wall installation means that the front and rear elevation of No.25 is no longer flush with its

neighbours and has 'squared off' the fenestration. The result is that, in addition to the loss of the red brick appearance to both elevations, on the front elevation the stone heads above the front door and bay are no longer visible, nor are the heads and cills of the first floor windows, which now appear recessed relative to their neighbours. Further, the soffit installed under the eaves, obscures the original roof dentils. I therefore find that the rendered external wall insulation would cause significant harm to the traditional character of No.25.

7. To the west side of Stanley Road, No.25 forms part of relatively long terrace of red brick dwellings. Although there have been alterations to both the front and rear of these dwellings, there is nonetheless an overall cohesiveness to the terrace, particularly in terms of materials, and paired or groups of dwellings have similar bay and fenestration details. The external insulation and render finish that has been installed to No.25 appears both stark and modern, incongruous in the context of this wider terrace. I observed it results in the front elevation of No.25 appearing unduly prominent in the streetscene, when viewed from both Stanley Road, and its junction with Stanley Street. The dark grey colour only serves to exacerbate this prominence.
8. I note that the appellant has drawn my attention to the neighbouring dwelling at No.27 Stanley Road which has been painted cream. However, the finish of this paint is failing and it does not itself appear sympathetic to the wider terrace, adding little weight to the appellant's case.
9. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the external wall insulation and render finish causes significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. Consequently, it conflicts with policies SP23, LP56 and LP57 of the Local Plan 2036, Volume 1 Development Strategy, Strategic and Local Policies (2024) (LP) which together require new development, including alterations and extensions to dwellings, to respect the character and overall quality of the locality, and original dwelling, in terms of design and materials.

Other Matters

10. I understand from the appellant's evidence that the external wall insulation boards were installed in good faith by a specialist company in a package backed by Central Government to improve insulation values of uninsulated properties. I have been provided with limited information regarding this, and I note that whilst the government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework supports sustainable development, good design is a key aspect of it (paragraph 131). Therefore, whilst I do have sympathy for the appellant, I have nothing before me in this case which outweighs the significant harm found to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider terrace.

Conclusion

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

R.Jones

INSPECTOR