



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2019

by Robert Hitchcock BSc DipCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/W/19/3232546

**Plot 3, Land off Old Lane / Taylor Lane, Scapegoat Hill, Huddersfield
HD7 4PQ.**

- 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 Bradley against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2018/62/93573/W, dated 12 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a garage and storage supplementary to plot 3 of previously approved scheme on appeal reference APP/Z4718/W/3180494.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

3. The site is set on a steep south-facing slope within the village setting of mainly stone-built housing. The older hilltop development to the north is of close terraces and traditional detached buildings. More recent development has intertwined with the original settlement pattern and extended along ribbons on the lower slopes following the rural lane network and private lanes facilitating intermediate plots. The later development is generally within larger plots and shows more diversity in its architectural styling, including varying design responses to accommodate the steeper land profiles.
4. Due to the nature of the historic development of the village, the older properties show a higher density with few outbuildings other than small sheds apparent within the more limited plots. Later development generally provides for the accommodation of vehicles through integral facilities or modest detached garages and outbuildings subordinate in scale to the host building.
5. The proposed garage would appear subordinate to the dwelling it is intended to serve and retain a ratio of development to plot size similar to other examples in the locality. However, the building's footprint, possibly exceeding 50% of that of the approved dwelling, and the large outward facing roofscape would present as a significant scale of development. This scale is more comparable to a

- primary form of accommodation in the locality than that of an ancillary outbuilding.
6. Notwithstanding the proposed inseting of the building to the local topography, the scale of the approved dwelling and use of materials to match it, the size of the garage/store would fail to reflect the substantially more modest relationships between residential accommodation and their ancillary buildings prevalent in the area. This would appear at significant odds with the local grain of development and fail to reflect the established local character of the townscape.
 7. Although no demonstration of need for the building is required, the appellant suggests that the garage/store would provide additional parking facilities to meet the needs of occupiers alongside any visitor demand and necessary storage. Due to the scarcity of suitable on-street parking in the immediate vicinity, I have some sympathy with that stance. However, given the level of parking previously secured and the potential to provide additional building/s on the site, this would not attract sufficient weight to outweigh the identified harm.
 8. I note an earlier appeal scheme on the site (ref: 3180494) and have taken it into account. However, I do not consider that it provides justification for overcoming the harm I have identified here; a proposal which I have considered on its own planning merits.
 9. The proposed development would therefore fail to reflect the character of the existing local townscape. As such it would be contrary to Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan (Feb 2019) which, amongst other aims, seeks to ensure that the form, scale, layout and details of developments should respect and enhance the character of the townscape.
 10. The proposed development would be contrary to the adopted development plan, and there are no material considerations indicating a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Hitchcock

Inspector