



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 December 2025

by J D Clark BA (Hons) DpTRP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/W/25/3374047

36 High Street, New Sharlston, Wakefield WF4 1BE

- 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 Pamela Harris against the decision of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01468/FUL.
 - The development proposed is dropped kerb outside the property to allow car parking alongside house. Addition of hardstanding, limestone chippings on hardcore.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is the end house in a row of dwellings of different designs fronting High Street. Colliery Street runs off High Street, adjacent to No 38, and off-street parking for No 36 High Street, comprising a garage and driveway, is located here. The row of houses, including No 36, 38 and those to the west of Colliery Street have been designed without driveways or any parking provision off High Street. There is open countryside to the east of No 38 and on the opposite side of the road. This, and the design of the houses denotes the character of the surrounding area as a semi-rural one.
4. It is clear that the appeal site, together with those fronting High Street were designed with parking spaces provided off Colliery Street. The frontage includes a small area of domestic garden and a grassed highway verge. Other houses along the row have a low timber post fence to the front marking the edge of the garden and the grass verge. At the time of my site visit this had been removed from the appeal site.
5. The proposal would introduce a new vehicular crossing where currently there are none. Also, in addition to creating parking space to the side of the house, a driveway and turning area would be constructed to the front. This would involve constructing a hardstanding area over the grassed verge. The appearance of the proposed works would be detrimental to the verdant and open character of the area to the front of No 36.

6. I note that Nos 38 and 38 are separated from the rest of the row of houses along this part of High Street by Colliery Street. However, this does not lessen their appearance as part of that group. Although Colliery Street breaks the continuity, it is not so great as to erode the cohesive green frontage. Whilst No 36 is at the end of the row, it is prominent and highlights a physical connection with the rural landscape around it. If anything, its position reinforces the semi-rural character of the area denoted by the transition between the open fields and the built-up area.
7. I appreciate that the choice of surfacing materials and additional landscaping could soften the effect of the proposal but this would not be sufficient to lessen its impact on the character and appearance of this area.
8. Local Plan¹ Policies SP23, LP56 and LP57 seek to protect the character of an area, amongst other things. For the above reasons, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area in conflict with these policies.

Other Matters

9. I note that there are no objections from the Council's Highway Officer who recommends conditions relating to surfacing, drainage, cycle storage and electric vehicle charging. There is therefore no dispute between the parties regarding highway safety. I have no reason to conclude differently on this matter. However, this does not overcome the harm I have identified in my main issue.
10. A previous planning application for a similar proposal was refused and dismissed on appeal². Limited details of this earlier proposal have been included in the appeal documents (a copy of the appeal decision or plans have not been submitted) but from the information before me there are substantial differences. Firstly, the site was in the Green Belt but has since been removed from this designation. Secondly, a new development plan has been adopted. Thirdly, highway safety was one of the main issues in that proposal. I have already stated that this is not a matter of concern in this proposal. However, whilst I agree some matters have changed since that decision, the impact on the character and appearance of the area has not.
11. Parking provision for this property includes the dedicated parking space (garage and driveway) off Colliery Street together with additional visitor parking on the estate. The Council's current standard set out in its SPD³ requires dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms to have three spaces. The additional space proposed would be a benefit to the occupiers of the appeal dwelling. The SPD indicates that this minimum provision is required in recognition of on-street parking congestion. However, I have no substantive evidence that congestion is at such a level at the appeal location to elevate this matter to such a degree as to overcome the harm I have identified.
12. Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework promotes sustainable transport, supporting opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport. I note that there is a bus stop on the opposite side of the road and whilst no details have

¹ Wakefield Council – Wakefield District Local Plan 2036 Planning Growth and Protecting Places Volume 1 Development Strategy, Strategic and Local Policies Adopted 24 January 2024.

² Planning Application Ref: 22/00212/FUL & Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/22/3303396.

³ Wakefield Council – Wakefield Council Street Design Guide – A guide for residential, commercial and mixed use development in Wakefield district, Adopted 18 January 2012 (SPD).

been supplied as to the regularity of any bus service, this clearly provides some access to public transport in very close proximity to the appeal site. There is also space on the appeal site for bicycle storage and although the appellant states that the proposal would enable an electric charging point to be added, which would support low carbon energy, I have no evidence to suggest that this could not be provided in the garage associated with this house off Colliery Street.

13. I note the appellant's reference to creating a hardstanding area under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class F of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order, 2015 (As Amended). However, no details have been submitted as to the scale of the hardstanding area that could be constructed without planning permission nor is it clear how much of the area in front of the house is residential curtilage as opposed to highway grassed verge. Therefore, I have afforded this matter little weight.

Conclusion

14. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Consequently, for the above reasons, the appeal should be dismissed.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR