



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2025 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/25/3364384

25 Valley View Road, Ossett, West Yorkshire WF5 8LZ

- 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 Mrs. Amanda Dawn Hindle against the decision of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01678/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as “demolish existing concrete sectional garage with asbestos roof. Replace with brick/concrete block built garage with apex tiled roof. Side door side window and roller shutter front door.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to “demolish existing concrete sectional garage with asbestos roof. Replace with brick/concrete block built garage with apex tiled roof. Side door side window and roller shutter front door” at 25 Valley View Road, Ossett, West Yorkshire WF5 8LZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01678/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted relates to the following approved plans, drawing references: b90f/uk/1163826/1564506 and Proposed Replacement Garage.

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 and Main Issue

3. The description of development does not refer to the retrospective nature of the garage, but it is clear from the main parties’ cases and my site visit that this is so. The main issue in regard to which is its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 27 Valley View Road (No. 27) with specific regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is part of a relatively tight cluster of dwellings arranged around and facing three road frontages. Rear gardens are a modest size, abutting each other and typically enclosed by close boarded fencing and extensions/outbuildings to neighbouring dwellings. The rear elevation of the appeal scheme abuts the side boundary of No 27. Its rear garden is on a lower ground level to both this and the side elevation of No 23’s single storey side extension. The garage subject of the appeal replaced a previous flat roofed example in broadly the same location.

5. By virtue of the existing arrangement and composition of surrounding buildings, boundary treatments and the local topography, the rear garden to No 27 is already significantly enclosed. The new garage is taller, but not significantly so when compared to the previous one. Its pitched roof means the overall height tapers and thus the visual impression of the enlargement is tempered. There is no doubt that it has an effect on the outlook from both the ground floor rear windows of No 27 and the garden, but not such that it would amount to being overbearing to occupiers/users of either for the reasons I have set out. Whilst the garage is visible from above the boundary fence, it still provides substantial screening of its lower bulk. Its siting toward the rear boundary of No 27's garden also allows a degree of open aspect to exist through the gap between the new garage and No. 27's conservatory.
6. The development does not therefore harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 27. Accordingly, it does not conflict with Policies LP56 or LP57 of the Wakefield District Local Plan 2024 and the Wakefield District Residential Design Guide Part 2 Supplementary Planning Document 2018. Together, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure extensions and alterations are not overbearing and for developments to have no significant detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring users or residents.

Other Matters

7. The matter of the garage's effect on the character and appearance of the area or light for the occupiers of No. 27 were not contentious in the appeal. For the same reasons as I have set out above, I do not disagree with the Council's conclusions on the latter. The garage is finished in materials which are a suitable match for the surrounding buildings and whilst flat roof garages are common in the area, the pitched roof design matches that of the host dwelling. There is nothing to suggest that garage would be used for purposes other than those incidental to the dwelling. I do not therefore see that noise or light pollution issues would arise therefrom.

Condition

8. To provide certainty and for enforcement purposes, it is necessary to impose a condition to specify the approved plans. The materials are shown thereon and what the garage has been finished in on site is acceptable for the area. Limiting additional future openings in the garage would not be necessary given the intended use of it and the placement/height of abutting garden boundary treatments both actual and possible.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed given it complies with the development plan and there is nothing compelling to suggest a decision other than in accordance therewith.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions set out.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR