
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2017

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/17/3172298

12 Woodroyd Avenue, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6LG

- 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 Lynda Wood against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2017/62/90175/W, dated 17 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a side dormer and alterations to rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the extension upon the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Woodroyd Avenue is characterised by dwellings with low eaves and steeply pitched roofs with gables at the front and rear. The appeal house is of this design. It has a large dormer to one roof slope and the proposal is to install a similar dormer to the other roof slope. In addition, the rear elevation, which can be seen from the fields to the rear, would be built up, significantly increasing the rear eaves height.
 4. This would result in the rear of the house having a shallow roof which would look squat and disproportionate to the height of the walls. It would also be out of character with the low-eaved design of the dwelling and those surrounding it. Furthermore, it is unclear from the plans how the dormers would tie in with the built up rear elevation and I have concerns about how this might look, especially from the side view which can be glimpsed from Woodroyd Avenue. I appreciate that other properties in the road have been extended but my attention has not been drawn to any extensions quite like the proposed one.
 5. Overall, the extension would be unsympathetic and incongruous to the design of the host building which would, in turn, harm the character and appearance of the house and wider area. Consequently, I find conflict with Policies D2, BE1, BE2, BE13 and BE14 of the Kirklees Unitary Development Plan which, in combination, seek to protect visual amenity and ensure that development is in keeping with any surrounding development in respect of its design.
-

Furthermore, it would conflict with Chapter 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework which encourages good design.

6. I have considered all other matters raised, but none outweigh the conclusions I have reached.
7. Therefore, I dismiss the appeal.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR