



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2024 by T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/23/3330306

111 St Oswald Road, Wakefield, West Yorkshire WF2 8EJ

- 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 Mike Pretorius against the decision of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01221/FUL, dated 02 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension to the rear (retrospective), single storey extension to the front (retrospective) and replacement of boundary wall and gate to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The development the subject of this appeal incorporates a proposed rear extension, front extension, and boundary wall and gate. The delegated report found no issues with regards to the rear single storey extension. From all I have seen and read I would agree with this conclusion. Therefore, whilst the whole scheme is before me, this appeal is focussed on the single storey front extension and front boundary treatment, which is the sole focus in both the decision notice issued by the Council and in the Appellants Statement of Case.
4. As some of the development that is the focus of this appeal is yet to be implemented, I have assessed the boundary wall and front extension based on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed single storey front extension and replacement boundary wall and gate on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached property occupying a prominent position at the intersection of St Oswald Road and Neville Road. The brick and half rendered construction of the property with a red tiled roof, mirrors the

- style of other paired properties in the vicinity. These properties typically have simple frontages with no front extensions. They are set back from the main road behind low level timber fencing or hedging. Gates, in the limited examples where they are present, are typically designed to allow views through.
7. Collectively, these factors contribute positively to a pleasant open character and consistency in terms of the appearance of the properties and the height and form of boundary treatment.
 8. The front extension with a 2 metre depth and 2.5 metre width, would appear as a large and dominant addition on the front of the host property, highly visible in the street scene. Although the porch would have a door on the side elevation, along with roof lights, the front street facing elevation of the proposal would be blank. This would visually disrupt the existing rhythm of openings on the front elevation and the detailed design would therefore appear out of place against the uniformity and simple character of the surrounding properties.
 9. The grey slate finish to the walls and grey roof tiles, would not reflect the materials used on the host dwelling or wider streetscene, resulting in a visual jarring against the existing materials. Therefore, collectively the materials, size, and design of the front extension would result in an incongruous feature, representing a poor design that would conflict with the appearance of both the host dwelling and wider street scene.
 10. Turning to the boundary treatment, the use of timber fence panels in themselves would not appear as a discordant addition or be uncharacteristic in the context of the area. However, given the proposed boundary treatment height, along with the solidity of the gates with brick pillars, the boundary treatment as a whole would appear as an incongruous and visually dominant addition, at odds with the height and form of prevailing boundary treatments in the vicinity. The proposal would lead to a much stronger sense of enclosure, which as a result, would unacceptably erode the open quality of the area, with the location of the appeal property amplifying the proposed boundary treatments prominence in wider views.
 11. For the above reasons, the single storey front extension and front boundary treatment would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. This would be contrary to Policy CS10 of the Wakefield Local Development Framework: Core Strategy (2009) and Policies D9 and D10(d) of the Wakefield Local Development Framework: Development Policies (2009). Taken together, amongst other matters, these require proposals to respect and enhance the character of the area and positively contribute to the locality by virtue of good design. There would also be conflict with the guidance contained in the Part 2 Residential Design Guide (2018) which requires proposals to respect local character.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has raised concerns over how the planning application was dealt with by the Council. Whilst I have had regard to these concerns, these are not matters which are relevant to the determination of the planning merits of this appeal. I have not therefore attached any significant weight to this matter.

13. The appellant has expressed a desire to increase privacy and security. However, I am not persuaded that a boundary of the design proposed would be the only way of achieving security and privacy at the site, and in any event, I have not been presented with any compelling evidence that levels of crime are a particular issue in the area. For these reasons I have attached very limited weight to these matters, which I consider would be insufficient to outweigh the harm identified to the character and appearance of the area.
14. Whilst the Council have found no issues with the height of the proposal in relation to highway safety, the absence of harm is a neutral matter and does not outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. The appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan, taken as a whole. There are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a recommendation other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Bennett

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR