

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2017

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/17/3167677

49 Lidgett Lane, Skelmanthorpe, Huddersfield, HD8 9AQ

- 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 Andree Ackroyd against the decision of Kirklees Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/62/93586/E, dated 19 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is modifications to the front-facing dormer and under-finish to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the appeal development stated in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. However, the description given in the Council's decision notice is the "erection of extension and alterations to front dormer". In my opinion, the Council's wording is a clearer description of the proposal and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow with two front-facing dormer windows in the roof. It is situated in a residential area within a row of properties that front Lidgett Lane. Other dwellings in the locality vary in terms of their age, size and appearance. Some of these also have front-facing dormers, which are either later additions or part of the original dwelling design.
 5. The proposal is to extend the existing dormers at the front of the appeal dwelling by infilling the existing gap between the two. The extension would provide additional space within the existing bedrooms that the appellant considers necessary for her family needs.
 6. Policies BE1 and BE2 of the adopted Kirklees Unitary Development Plan (UDP) require (amongst other things) all development to be attractive and of good
-

quality design; and to be in keeping with surrounding development. In addition, Policy BE15 of the UDP lists criteria against which proposals for front-facing dormer windows are assessed. A key requirement of Policy BE15 is that the original roof form remains the predominant feature. In my opinion, these policies are consistent with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which also requires new development to be of high quality design and for it to add to the overall quality of the area (paragraphs 17 and 58).

7. I acknowledge that the proposal would provide more useable space within the first floor bedrooms. At my site visit, I also viewed some of the other dwellings with front-facing dormers, including properties on Lidgett Lane and Westfield Drive. However, in my opinion, the proposal would be an incongruous and discordant addition at the front of the dwelling. As a result of the extension, the dormer structure would be a visually dominant feature and, overall, I consider that it would be out of proportion and scale with the original roof of the property. It would be clearly seen from Lidgett Lane and I consider that the proposal would be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the both the existing dwelling and the streetscene. Consequently, it would conflict with the Development Plan and with the Framework, as referred to above.

Other Matters

8. The Council Officer's report refers to the conversion of a garage to a bedroom and new render on the front elevation. The Council states that these elements are permitted development. Consequently, I am not required to consider them as part of this appeal.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR