
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2017

by Michael Moffoot DipTP MRTPI DipMgt MCMI

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

Decision date: 15th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/16/3165931

35 Station Road, Fenay Bridge, Huddersfield HD8 0AA

- 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 Mrs Alison Grant against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 2016/62/91707/W, dated 19 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is dormer loft conversion with dormers front and rear to form additional bedrooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. It is submitted that planning permission is not required for the proposed dormer to the rear of the dwelling. This is not an issue before me however, and the opportunity exists for the appellant to pursue the matter through procedures set out in sections 191 and 192 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
3. That said, there is no dispute between the parties as to the acceptability of the rear dormer. I am satisfied that this aspect of the proposal would cause no material harm and would not conflict with any development plan policies I have been referred to. I shall therefore confine my detailed considerations to the front dormer.
4. The appellant has suggested a reduction in the size of the front dormer. However, this is not in plan form and has not been subject to public consultation. I shall therefore determine the appeal on the basis of the application plans as refused.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is prominently located at a bend on the busy Station Road in a predominantly residential area characterised by dwellings of various age, style, form and materials. The end-of-terrace property is constructed of stone and brick under a slate roof and sits slightly higher than many other dwellings in the area due to the steeply sloping nature of this section of Station Road. The
-

proposed dormer would feature tile hanging to the front and sides and GRP cladding to the roof.

7. Saved policy BE15 *Kirklees Unitary Development Plan* [Revised 2007] ('the UDP') states that dormer extensions to front or main elevations of dwellings will normally be permitted provided that certain detailed criteria are met. Applying them to this case, the proposed dormer would exceed 50% of the width of the original roof and would not be centrally placed. Moreover, it would not achieve the required 1m set back from the gutter line nor would it be set down from the ridge by the stipulated distance. The dormer would be a large, box-like feature that would dominate the roof and front elevation of the dwelling and seriously unbalance the visual rhythm of the terrace. It would be a discordant addition to the street scene on a highly prominent site and would severely compromise the visual amenity of this stretch of Station Road, where no similar front dormers are evident or have been drawn to my attention.
8. In coming to these findings, I acknowledge that the use of tile hanging to the front and cheeks of the dormer would be less conspicuous than white uPVC cladding. However, this does not overcome my concerns regarding the inappropriate design and scale of the proposal.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would seriously harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with those parts of policies D2, BE1, BE2 and BE15 of the UDP which seek to safeguard the visual amenity and character of an area, and secure good quality design that contributes to the built environment and is in keeping with surrounding development in respect of design and scale.
10. The appeal therefore fails in relation to the front dormer. Whilst I consider the rear dormer to be acceptable, it is reliant upon the front dormer to provide access via a new staircase according to the plans. This is a matter for the appellant to pursue with the Council should she wish.

Michael Moffoot

Inspector