



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by R Hall BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/24/3356116

37 Watson Crescent, Wakefield WF1 4QP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Rashid Mahood against the decision of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00711/FUL.
 - The development proposed is rear single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for rear single storey extension at 37 Watson Crescent, Wakefield WF1 4QP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00711/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing refs: Location Plan and Elevation Plan
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed on the side elevations of the development hereby permitted.

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area; and the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants of 39 Watson Crescent with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The appeal building is a two storey semi detached dwelling. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and consists of other similar semi detached properties with gardens to the rear. There are a range of different extensions of different heights and roof types situated to the rear of the properties on Watson Crescent. The proposed extension would be viewed in this context. The wider area is also varied in its architectural styles.
5. The proposed extension would be set in from the boundary at either side and modest in depth relative to the existing building. In addition, the extension would be read as clearly subservient to the existing dwelling by virtue of its single storey form and flat roof design. Furthermore, whilst differing in roof design, it would be constructed in matching materials and of a sufficiently relatable design with matching fenestration to the existing dwelling.
6. Therefore, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the wider area. It would therefore comply with policies SP23, LP56 and LP57 of the Wakefield District Local Plan 2036 (2024) (Local Plan). These generally seek to incorporate buildings that are appropriate to their location in terms of scale and density.

Living conditions

7. The proposal would extend beyond the rear elevation of the existing extension and would be visible over the modest timber fence separating the appeal site from No 39. Nevertheless, it would be generously set in from the boundary. Even if the various detached outbuildings against the boundary in the rear garden of No.39 were removed, the proposed flat roof design and modest scale of the extension would provide an acceptable outlook for the occupants of No.39.
8. Therefore, the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of No 39, with specific regard to outlook. As such, the proposal would comply with Policies LP56 and LP57 of the Local Plan, which both seek amongst other things for extensions and alterations to dwellings to respect residential amenity.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area and the host property, it is necessary to impose a planning condition requiring the use of matching materials. A condition requiring the removal of permitted development rights to prevent the installation of additional windows is clearly justified in this instance, in the interests of protecting the living conditions of neighbouring occupants.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposal would comply with the development plan and the material considerations in this instance do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. I therefore recommend the appeal be allowed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

R Hall

INSPECTOR