

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2016

**by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 10 November 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/16/3156123**

**9 Cross Lane, Skelmanthorpe, Huddersfield, West Yorkshire, HD8 9BR**

- 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 Mr S Dyson against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 2016/62/90388/E, dated 4 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2016.
  - The development proposed is a dormer extension and external alterations.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. The application was amended during the course of the Council's determination of the proposal. Although the Council's decision notice describes the proposal as the "*erection of front and rear dormers*" I am satisfied that the description set out in the heading above, which I have taken from the appellant's planning application form, accurately describes the proposal. It is clear that the Council have determined the appeal on this basis, and therefore so shall I.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host building, and upon the surrounding area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow situated midway along a gently curving street of similarly sized bungalows. The buildings have in common a somewhat squat appearance, arising from their relatively generous width and generally shallow pitched roofs and low ridge heights. The buildings share a common orientation and form along the length of Cross Lane, which is carried over onto Ashfield Avenue to the rear. The uniformity and consistency of the roof lines and ridge levels is particularly evident in longer views along Cross Lane, where the gentle curve of the street emphasises the pleasing rhythm and uniformity of the dwellings.
  5. The proposed dormer extension would be situated on the rear facing roof plane of 9 Cross Lane. However, in order to attain sufficient internal ceiling heights within the converted roof space the dormer extension would project above the
-

height of No 9's existing ridge level by approximately 0.5 metres. Although its width would reflect the width of the bungalow's existing ridgeline, the dormer extension would stand proud of it. As a consequence, the structure, marked out by the external cladding of the dormer cheeks and fascia above, would sit incongruously above the existing ridgeline of the appeal property.

6. Viewed from either side, and in longer views along Cross Lane, it would sit uncomfortably on the roof of the appeal property. From these aspects, the box-like form of the dormer extension would appear as if dropped onto the roof. Its vertical, upvc-clad, dormer cheeks would be at odds with the sloping, tiled roof-planes at the front and side of No 9, whilst the dormer extension's height and form would be obtrusively jarring in the context of the slopes, angles and proportions of the main building's roof, and roofline, and those of the adjacent bungalows.
7. Within an area of housing characterised by consistent ridge levels and only limited variation in the appearance of the bungalows, the proposed extension would be an incongruous and awkwardly jarring addition to the host building, and to the street scene as a whole. Thus, the proposal would not be in keeping with the surrounding area in terms of its design or resulting building height, nor would it be visually attractive, and it would therefore fail to achieve the good design quality sought by Kirklees Unitary Development Plan (KUDP) policy BE1. The general design criteria set out in KUDP policy BE2 in relation to new development, particularly at policy BE2(i), is, I conclude, equally applicable to extensions to existing buildings as it would be to new development. Moreover, KUDP policies BE1 and BE2 both reflect the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to secure high quality design as a core planning principle, and which the proposal would also be at odds with.
8. I note the appellant's suggestion that the increased ridge height and dormer extension is necessary to accommodate stair access to the proposed loft area. I note, too, that it is not disputed that the proposal would not have a harmful impact upon, nor be visually intrusive from, Ashfield Road, to the rear. However, these factors do not outweigh the harm to the character or appearance of the host property, or the street scene, that I have identified above.

## **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons set out, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Graeme Robbie*

INSPECTOR