



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2017

by J D Westbrook BSc(hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/17/3179247

**Rose Hill Cottage, Meltham Road, Marsden, Huddersfield, Yorkshire,
HD7 6EH**

- 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 Kendrick Whitehead against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Council.
 - The application Ref 2017/62/90417/W, dated 5 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a dormer window to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The submitted plans show the overall development as including both front and rear dormer windows. The application form refers only to the front dormer and the Council has taken the view that this relates to the fact that the rear dormer could be constructed using permitted development rights. I concur with this view and the main issue therefore reflects this.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed front dormer on the character and appearance of the area around Meltham Road, and the setting of the adjacent Marsden Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. Rose Hill Cottage is a small detached bungalow situated on the south side of Meltham Road, close to its junction with Manchester Road and Brougham Road. The properties on the north side of Manchester Road, including those on Brougham Road lie within the Marsden Conservation Area (CA). Rose Hill Cottage, along with the row of terraced houses to the west of the appeal property, is not included in the CA, although the detached house immediately to the east of the bungalow is within the CA. There is a row of more modern brick-built terraced houses to the rear of the bungalow.
5. By virtue of the topography of the area, Rose Hill Cottage is set well above the road. It is partly hidden behind a front hedge but the roof in particular is readily visible in the street scene from around the road junction, and especially

when approaching from Brougham Road where it forms something of a terminal vista. It is stone-built with a shallow slate roof that has a gable at the eastern end and a hipped roof at the western end. It has a small front garden below the level of the dwelling, and another small garden to the eastern side. At the rear there is an open area of land that appears to relate to the more modern houses behind.

6. The proposed development would involve the construction of a large flat-roofed dormer to the rear roof slope, extending between the gable end and the start of the hipped element. It would also involve the construction of a smaller flat-roofed dormer to the front roof slope that would be set in a little from the gable end and up a little from the eaves. It would also be set in from the western end of the ridge. This front dormer would have a large, wide front window and a small window in each of the side cheeks. It would appear that the dormer would be some 3 metres wide with a forward projection of around 3.7 metres and a height of 2 metres extending up to ridge level.
7. Other than a small front dormer within the steep roof slopes of Brougham Road, there would appear to be no dormers of the scale and design of that proposed for the appeal property in the vicinity, whether inside or outside of the CA. The front dormer proposed at Rose Hill Cottage would, therefore, be significantly out of character with the surrounding area. Moreover, given the scale and design of the dormer on what is a relatively small bungalow with a shallow pitched roof, it would appear out of scale with the host property, while the large horizontally aligned front window would appear out of character with the small vertically aligned windows in the front elevation of the bungalow.
8. On the basis of the above, I find that the proposed front dormer would not respect the design features of the existing bungalow and adjacent buildings, nor those features creating the wider local identity. It would also be detrimental to the visual amenity of the local area. It would therefore, conflict with Policies BE1, BE2, BE5, BE13, BE14 and BE15 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan, which relate to the design of new developments, including the design of developments in Conservation Areas and the design criteria for the construction of dormers.
9. In conclusion, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area around Meltham Road and it would also, therefore, fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding CA.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR