
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2017

by Harold Stephens BA MPhil DipTP MRTPI FRSA

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

Decision date: 24 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/17/3170909
14 Standiforth Road, Huddersfield HD5 9HD

- 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 G Ison against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/62/93166/W dated 20 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension with rooms in the roofspace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal proposal relates to a semi-detached dwelling faced with render on a stone plinth. The property is single storey with a bay window to the front elevation. To the rear elevation the property extends outwards on the western side with a single storey kitchen measuring about 4m x 2.9m and with a lean-to entrance porch attached to it.
 4. The submitted plans provide for an extension across the rear of the property with a pitched roof over to accommodate rooms in the roof. The rear extension would project some 4m from the rear elevation with an overall height of some 5.6m and an eaves height of some 2.7m. The roof would extend above the height of the existing ridge line by some 0.4m where it is proposed for a triangular glazed panel to be installed measuring some 0.94m². The proposed extension would be set in 0.9m from the shared boundary with the adjoining bungalow 16 Standiforth Road to the east. The extension would be finished with a stone plinth course with some render and cedar boarding.
 5. The statutory development plan includes the saved policies of the Kirklees Unitary Development Plan (UDP). The Council's Local Plan was published for consultation in November 2016 and in accordance with the guidance in paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has limited weight in planning decisions at this stage. The site is unallocated on the UDP Proposals Map and saved policies D2, BE1, BE2, BE13 and BE14 are relevant in this case. The NPPF is a material consideration in this case.
-

6. At my visit I saw that the property lies within a residential area where there are both bungalows and two storey dwellings. The original built form of the bungalows on Standiforth Road is similar although not entirely uniform in style and appearance as many have been altered with a variety of rear extensions and roof alterations reflecting individual tastes and needs. The Appellant considers the proposal to be well designed and would meet family needs in terms of room sizes and configuration. I disagree for a number of reasons.
7. Firstly, the overall height and mass of the extension would create an overpowering and dominant feature in relation to the existing dwelling. The scale and bulk of the extension would not form an appropriate addition to this modest bungalow. Secondly, the pitched roof of the extension would not be tied into the original roof but set at a higher level extending 0.4m above the existing ridge line. The extension would therefore appear disjointed from the host dwelling creating a dominant feature from the east and west elevations and obliquely when viewed from Standiforth Road. Thirdly, the extension would appear out of keeping with other properties within the vicinity. The other properties in the vicinity are true single storey dwellings when viewed from the front even where dormers may have been added to the rear. The scale and height of the appeal proposal would therefore be an incongruous feature.
8. Given the overall height of the extension and the roof design, the appeal proposal would result in an incongruous and dominant feature which would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would be contrary to Policies D2 (vi and vii), BE1 (i and ii), BE2 (i), BE13 (iii) and BE14 of the UDP and to section 7 of the NPPF which requires good design. On the main issue I conclude that the appeal must fail.
9. I have taken into account all other matters raised. I acknowledge that the window within the western elevation would result in some overlooking at ground floor level onto a window at 12 Standiforth Road. However, I find that this would not cause significant harm to the living conditions at that property and could be dealt with by means of a planning condition. Subject to this the proposal would be acceptable in terms of residential amenity in that it would not adversely impact on the privacy, outlook or daylight of neighbours and would not offend aforementioned policies in this regard. There would be no detriment to highway safety from the proposals.
10. Reference is made to other properties within the wider area where extensions have been approved by the Council. I do not have all the details about these properties. However, none of these developments persuaded me that the appeal proposal would be appropriate in this situation. Suffice it to say that each decision must be considered on its own merits and in accordance with the provisions of the development plan and any other material considerations. Planning conditions would not overcome the objections I have described. I conclude that the proposal is in overall conflict with the development plan. None of the points raised are sufficient to outweigh this conflict. The proposal would not constitute sustainable development. My overall conclusion is that the appeal should be dismissed.

Harold Stephens

INSPECTOR