
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2020

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/20/3252010

60 High Street, Scapegoat Hill, Huddersfield HD7 4NJ

- 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 Andy Townend against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/62/90167/W, dated 17 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension and first floor extension with balcony and alterations to convert garage to extend living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has been altered from the application form to the Council decision notice. The latter description more fully describes the proposal and I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace of which it forms part of and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is the end dwelling on a set of traditionally designed stone built terraced properties, which are also typical of the general character of the wider area. These established properties contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area. The proposals include a two-storey rear/side extension and a single storey rear extension.
5. The two-storey side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the property and would incorporate a roof ridgeline that would be lower than that on the main dwelling. This being the case, it would be subordinate in terms of its bulk and mass to the main dwelling along with the other elements of the scheme.
6. However, the two-storey side extension would incorporate a number of features which would be out of character with the existing property, terrace and wider area. These relate to a balcony to the front elevation at first floor level with steel balustrading and glazed panels, the provision of a decorative

gable feature on the front roof slope and the fitting of vertical timber cladding to the extension at first floor level.

7. Although the two-storey side extension would be set back significantly, it would remain clearly visible in the wider street scene given that the dwellings immediately to the east are set back similarly from High Street, which enable clear views towards the extension. Views towards it would not therefore just be available from directly in front of the property.
8. Whilst innovation in design along with the use of more contemporary materials can on some occasions be appropriate, the introduction of the three features detailed above would cumulatively result in a proposal that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace and the area.
9. Although it has been suggested that similar materials have been used on a dwelling to the rear of the appeal site, unlike the dwelling which is the subject of this appeal that property has only very limited or no visibility from High Street and the existence of timber cladding on that dwelling does not therefore provide justification for its use in this location.
10. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan (2019). Amongst other things, this policy requires that proposals should promote good design by ensuring the form and details of all development respects and enhances the character of the townscape and by ensuring that extensions are in keeping with existing buildings in terms of materials and details.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR