



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2025

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/25/3360414

87 Parkinson Close, Wakefield WF1 4NR

- 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 Ramunas Stongvila against the decision of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02025/FUL.
 - The development proposed is double storey side extension as well as ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for double storey side extension as well as ground floor rear extension at 87 Parkinson Close, Wakefield WF1 4NR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/02025/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Site Location Plan and Site Block Plan PL04, Proposed Ground Floor, First and Roof Plan PL05, Proposed Elevations and Sections PL06, and Proposed 3D Views PL07.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. Parkinson Close is a cul-de-sac comprising detached and semi-detached dwellings. There are several spurs off the main stretch of Parkinson Close, forming enclaves that break up its otherwise linear form. The simple, consistent design of the houses creates a pleasing streetscape.
4. The host property is a detached two-storey dwelling that with 89 Parkinson Close (No 89) form a small group of properties between the head of the cul-de-sac and one of the spurs. Due to its position set back from the pavement, slightly behind the front elevation of No 89, and significantly behind the side elevation of 85 Parkinson Close, the host property is not prominent in the street scene.

5. The proposals include a single storey rear extension to which the Council has not objected. Based on the information before me, I agree that due to its small scale and position, it would not be harmful to, or compromise, the character and appearance of the host property or the area.
6. The Residential Design Guide Part 2: Guidance for Householders advises that side extensions should not alter the character of an area by creating an impression of a continuous building frontage and that the ideal way to prevent terracing is to maintain a meaningful gap between properties.
7. In this case, the proposed two storey side extension would result in the loss of the gap between the host property and No 89. Nonetheless, there are only two dwellings in the row and, therefore, the degree of continuous building frontage would be limited. Furthermore, the proposed drop in ridge line and set back of the extension from the front elevation of the host property which, in turn, is set back from No 89, would create visual breaks in the frontage. Rather than creating an unbalanced, and awkward facade to the two properties, the varying ridge lines and staggered front elevations would break up the built form, thereby avoiding an over dominant continuous building line. In combination, such features would reduce any sense of 'terracing' and ensure that the character of the host property and the street scene is not harmed.
8. For the above reasons, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area. Consequently, it would comply with the requirements of Policies LP56 and LP57 of the Local Development Framework Development Policies, which seek to secure high quality design and extensions that respect the character and scale of the dwellings and its location.

Conditions

9. I have, in the interests of certainty, attached conditions specifying the approved plans. A condition relating to matching materials is also necessary to ensure that the appearance of the new development would be satisfactory.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR