



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2019 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/19/3229098

8 The Crest, Bradley, Huddersfield, HD2 1QN

- 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 Aurangzeb Hussain against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Council.
 - The application Ref 2018/62/94133/W, dated 14 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side and single-storey front and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. Planning permission was granted in 2018 for single-storey side, front and rear extensions¹. The front and rear extensions have been built in accordance with the approved drawings, however the side extension has been built higher than was approved. The proposal before me effectively seeks to regularise the matter. As the Council has no objection to the single storey elements of the proposal, my determination of the appeal concentrates on the two-storey element.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the property and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The street is characterised by detached two-storey dwellings and bungalows that are traditionally designed with regular proportions and similar materials. The consistent appearance of the properties contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

¹ Application ref: 2018/62/92485/W

6. The side extension is set back from the front elevation of the main dwelling and has a ridge height that is lower than the existing roof. The exterior materials match those of the dwelling. However, the extension is neither fully two storeys in height nor single storey and its form has resulted in a design that includes a disproportionate amount of unrelieved masonry between the top of the windows and the roof. Consequently, the extension appears to be disproportionate and thereby discordant with the original dwelling and as such detracts from its character and appearance.
7. Furthermore, the appeal property is located on a corner plot and when viewed from the rear, and in particular from the junction with Park Hill, the side extension is a highly prominent feature that protrudes beyond the established building line. The height of the side extension adds to the prominence of the dwelling and as such the extended building appears bulky on its plot. In addition, its awkward design is highly visible in the street scene. Consequently, the development also detracts from the character and appearance of the area.
8. I acknowledge that the existing hedge when fully grown would soften and partially screen the appearance of the extension and that climbers could be encouraged on the rear and side walls. However, such planting would take some time to become established and could be cut down or removed at any point in the future. I am unconvinced therefore that such planting would negate the harm I have identified.
9. I note that other properties in the street have previously been extended. However, no documents have been submitted regarding any planning permissions for these extensions and it seems to me that in any event they are of designs that are not necessarily directly comparable with the appeal proposal. In any case I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
10. For these reasons, the side extension causes significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area and is therefore contrary to Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, which seeks to protect appearance and character through high quality design including through ensuring that the scale, form and appearance of a proposal ensures that it respects and is in keeping with its surroundings.

Other matters

11. No concerns were raised by the Council with regards to the effect on the neighbouring properties or highway safety, and I have no reason to disagree.
12. I acknowledge the appellant's reasons to provide an additional bedroom in the side extension as built. However, this private benefit does not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR