
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2017

by Daniel Hartley BA Hons MTP MBA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 07 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/17/3173404
43 Gladwin Street, Batley WF17 7RW

- 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 S Yoosoof against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/62/92785/E, dated 15 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single and two storey extension to front, side and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal upon (i) the character and appearance of the area and (ii) the living conditions of neighbouring residential properties in respect of light and outlook.

Reasons

Site and proposal

3. The appeal site comprises a brick built semi-detached house falling within a predominantly residential area. It is the last property in Gladwin Street and is opposite a terrace of stone built houses on Knowles Road. To its side there is Back Snowdon Street which includes a row of terraced buildings. Whilst there is a mixture of house styles and materials in the locality, in the main the properties have simple front facades and unbroken roof lines. Furthermore, there is a very noticeable sense of space between and around properties and this adds distinctive character to the area.
4. It is proposed to erect a two storey side extension to form a secondary staircase into a new en-suite loft bedroom. In addition, a single storey wrap around front/side extension is proposed to create a lobby, living room and WC/shower. There would also be a single storey rear extension to form a kitchen/dining room, four velux roof lights to the front roof slope and a dormer to the rear roof slope.

Character and appearance

5. I acknowledge that No 39 Gladwin Street includes a front and side extension. However, and notwithstanding the other planning permissions referred to by
-

the appellant, the majority of the dwellings in the area have simple and relatively unaltered front facades.

6. In this case, the front extension would be connected to a side extension which would be almost as wide as the original house. The rear corner of the side extension would be in very close proximity to Back Snowdon Street. When the front and side extensions are considered as a whole they would appear out of proportion and scale with the house. Such an adverse and discordant impact would be compounded by the fact that it is proposed to erect a large rear roof dormer and a two storey side extension.
7. Taking into account the scale, bulk and position of the whole of the proposed development, I consider that it would have a significantly dominating impact when viewed from the surrounding streets (and the adjacent footpath), would detract from the sense of space between and around properties and would not sufficiently maintain the overall balance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses. When considered as a whole, the development would appear as a series of very differently designed and interconnected extensions. Overall, there would be a distinct lack of design cohesion.
8. The above identified concerns would be compounded by the fact that four roof lights are proposed to the front roof slope. Most of the surrounding properties, including No 41 Gladwin Street, have unbroken roof slopes. In addition, the various extensions include the use of both hipped and gabled roofs at varying heights and the proposed two storey side extension would appear narrow and out of place on the side of the house. In particular, the use of a narrow window within the front elevation of the two storey side extension would not reflect the scale, design and proportions of other windows in the property and would have the effect of creating a dominant mass of front wall which would appear stark and incongruous when viewed from the street.
9. The proposed rear roof dormer would take up a very significant proportion of the rear roof slope of the appeal property. Given its overall bulk and width, I consider that it would appear as a top heavy addition to the roof slope and that it would appear incongruous and dominant when viewed from parts of Back Snowden Street.
10. For the collective reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed development would not accord with the design aims of saved Policies D2, BE1, BE2 and BE14 of the Kirklees Unitary Development Plan 1999 (UDP) and Chapter 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Living Conditions

11. The proposed single storey rear extension would have some impact upon the occupiers of No 41 Gladwin Street, but owing to its height and rear projection, the impact would not be significantly adverse in terms of loss of light, privacy or outlook.
12. Notwithstanding the above, the ground floor and first floor side extensions would be positioned in very close proximity to the windows belonging to No 50 Snowdon Street. When considered as a whole, the scale, bulk and proximity of the single and first floor side extensions would be such that it would have an unacceptably enclosing impact when viewed from the rear windows of No 50 Snowdon Street. I do not share the Council's view that this part of the

proposal would result in a material loss of light to the aforementioned properties taking into account the separation distances and as the first floor element of the side extension would be set some distance back from the appeal site boundary. However, this does not alter my view relating to the loss of outlook.

13. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would have a significantly overbearing impact upon the occupiers of No 50 Snowdon Street leading to a material loss of outlook. For this reason, the proposal would not accord with the amenity aims of saved Policies D2 and BE1 of the UDP and paragraph 17 of the Framework which states that planning should *"always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings"*.

Other Matters

14. The appellant has referred me to extensions that have been approved to other dwellings in Gladwin Street. I have not been provided with specific details relating to these planning permissions and so I do not know the exact circumstances which led to them being allowed. In any event, as part of my site visit I was able to view the proposal in the context of the street-scene as it exists now. I could not see any developments that were directly comparable to the appeal proposal or that had the same relationship with other existing properties. I have considered the appeal on its individual planning merits and concluded that the proposal would be unacceptable in planning terms.
15. None of the other matters raised outweigh or alter my conclusions on the main issues.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the development plan for the area. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Daniel Hartley

INSPECTOR