
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2nd February 2017

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/16/3162641

6 St Marks View, Longwood, Huddersfield, West Yorkshire, HD3 4TF.

- 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 Simon Holmes against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Council.
 - The application Ref: 2016/62/92227/W, dated 30 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is conversion of garage and two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of garage and two storey extension at 6 St Marks View, Longwood, Huddersfield, West Yorkshire, HD3 4TF, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 2016/62/92227/W, dated 30 June 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No: SMV01: Location Plan: 1:1250@ A4; Drawing No: SMV02: Existing Site Plan; Drawing No: SMV03: Existing Plans and Elevations; Drawing No: SMV04 Rev:A: Proposed Plans and Elevations.
 - 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 Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the implications of the proposal for (1) the character and appearance of the area and (2) highway safety.

Reasons

3. The proposed extension would be in place of an existing attached garage to the side of the property which is also link attached to the adjoining dwelling No 8. It would significantly increase the scale of the resultant dwelling, particularly at first floor. However, by virtue of the significant setback on both the front and rear elevations, it would not dominate the host property and would nonetheless appear as a harmonious addition thereto, despite the matching ridge line. The windows would not line through with the existing windows, but the difference would be scarcely noticeable on the front elevation and not discordant on the rear. Merely
-

because the pitched roof would not exactly match the existing roof forms on the property would not look out of place, as the existing dwelling has no particular symmetry in its design.

4. I accept the proposal would result in some loss of openness between the appeal property and its neighbour No 8. However, given the aforementioned setbacks to the front and rear elevations, coupled with the slightly higher ridge line than No 8 and the fact the latter property is of a different design, I do not accept that it would give rise to a true terracing effect. Moreover, as there are only two pairs of houses in this particular row, the relative spacing between them does not form a noticeable rhythm in the street scene, which it is essential to retain.
5. For these reasons, I conclude on the first main issue that the proposal would integrate comfortably with the host dwelling and prevailing character and appearance of the area. I thus find no conflict with saved Policies D2, BE1, BE2, BE13 and BE14 of the Kirklees Unitary Development Plan (Revised with effect from 28 September 2007) (UDP), or the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek to secure good quality design in new development (including residential extensions), which respects the design features of the existing house, is in keeping with its surroundings and does not result in an undesirable terracing effect.
6. The Council's concern in relation to the second main issue centres on the increase in size of the property generating an increased requirement for car parking. Although the proposal would retain the current car parking space, any additional parking on street, would it is maintained, compromise the safe and efficient use of the highway. This is not a proposition I accept for the following reasons.
7. Firstly, an additional bedroom does not automatically translate into increased car ownership and many additional bedrooms are occupied by children or utilised as guest accommodation on an occasional basis. I accept that if the proposal did generate additional car ownership at the property, this would likely be accommodated on street, but it does not follow that highway safety would be compromised as a result.
8. Although St Marks View has a narrow and relatively steeply graded access, it is possible to park on street in several places. Moreover, as a cul-de-sac it is very lightly trafficked. With this in mind and given the aforementioned narrow access and parking spaces, drivers are likely to be moving at very slow speed and exercise care when navigating in the vicinity. In such an environment, I cannot accept that any marginal increase in on street parking that did occur, would materially compromise the safe and free flow of traffic. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy T10 of the UDP, which seeks to avoid development which would create or materially add to highway safety.
9. The Council have not suggested any conditions other than the standard time limit for commencement of development, confining the approval to specified plans and requiring the use of matching materials. The latter two are necessary for the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory finish to the development and I shall therefore impose them.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR