



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2020 by C McDonagh BA (Hons), MA

By Jonathan Hockley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/19/3238826

245 Roberttown Lane, Roberttown, WF15 7LJ

- 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 Michael Helliwell against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/62/91735/E, dated 22 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is two-storey rear extension with dormer, side garage extension with room above and link building.
-

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issue in this case is the effects of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, stone built detached dwelling with a canopy adjoining a single-storey garage to the rear. An area of hardstanding is accessed via a track leading from Roberttown Lane and the property has garden on all sides.
5. The immediate area contains a mixture of housing types, with a relatively new housing estate at Springfield Court, traditional terraces and a detached bungalow. As such, there is no prevailing building style along this stretch of Roberttown Lane. The appeal property is relatively open in its layout, with gardens on all sides and no boundary treatments. This is in contrast to other houses along Roberttown Lane, which have little or no set-back from the road.
6. The side extension would project towards the access track sitting flush with the front elevation of the appeal property. The design of the proposal would result in the dwelling having an unduly elongated form and, due to the proposed blank wall, a significantly bulky appearance to the side when viewed from

Roberttown Lane. While I appreciate materials may be in keeping with the host property, that the extension would be set-back from the road, and that the lack of windows on this elevation is due to the proposal housing a garage, the mass of the side extension and lack of detailing would cause harm to the street scene in a prominent location. While the proposal may be shielded to a certain extent by the terrace in certain views, it would be clearly visible from other locations.

7. The rear extension would be two-storey and replace the existing garage and canopy. While the proposal would be set down from the ridge of the host roof, the scale and design of the extension with large areas of blank wall would add further significant mass and bulk to the building. Furthermore, when viewed from the side, there would be a notable lack of cohesion in the roofs of the resultant building, with a range of eaves and ridge heights creating visual confusion. When read in combination, the rear section of the house would appear overly large in scale and of an unsuitable design.
8. To conclude, the proposed side extension would be visually intrusive in the street scene, causing harm to the character and appearance of the local area. Moreover, the proposed rear extension would also harm the character and appearance of the host building and street scene. The development would therefore be contrary to Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. Together these seek, amongst other aims, good design at the core of all proposals by ensuring that the form, scale and details of development respect and enhance the character of the townscape and add to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matter

9. The appellant states there would be no issues regarding overlooking or general impacts upon the living conditions of occupiers of nearby dwellings. I am not aware of any objection to this matter made by the Council and as such have not considered it further.

Recommendation

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

C McDonagh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Jon Hockley

INSPECTOR