



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/21/3267939

286 Cliffe Lane, Gomersal, Cleckheaton BD19 4RZ

- 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 James Hutchinson against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/62/92856/E, dated 28 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is Erection of front and rear dormers and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The Council have raised no objection to the rear dormer, and I concur with that assessment. I will therefore make my assessment on the effect of the front dormer.
4. The appeal relates to a semi-detached house that lies within a group of similarly designed properties. Whilst alterations have resulted in some differences in appearance, the front elevations of these properties display common features, such as a porch over the front door and chimneys. The features of architectural interest and similarity in form result in the row of houses, including the appeal site, contributing positively to the significance, character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed dormer window would be positioned in the front facing roof slope. There is no significant screening to the front of the appeal property meaning most of its principal elevation and roof slope can be seen from the street and from properties on the opposite side of the road.
6. Whilst set below the ridge line, the dormer window would affect the appearance of the front of the house and how the property is seen from the street and properties opposite.
7. The dormer window would be positioned directly above the front windows to the property, continuing the lined positioning of the windows. Being flat roofed, the dormer would be at odds with the pitched main roof. Also, it would create a design feature that is not seen in this row of properties and unbalance the pair

of semi-detached dwellings when seen in the street scene. For these reasons, and despite its modest scale and the use of matching materials, the dormer window would appear awkward and a discordant feature on the front of the house.

8. The proposed development would lead to no harm being caused to the living conditions of the occupiers of any nearby property. However, the lack of harm in this regard is a neutral factor that is not a benefit of the scheme.
9. The introduction of the dormer in the front elevation would disrupt this uniformity. It would be a clearly obtrusive feature in the street, visible in long views along the road, and this would disrupt the area. The discordancy in the settled street scene would be heightened by elements of the design: the size would dominate the roof slope, with little space kept to the ridgeline.
10. As a result, I find the proposals are contrary to Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan (2019) which, amongst other matters, expects development to respect the form, scale and details of the character of the townscape.

Other Matters

11. I have had regard to the desire of the appellant to provide additional accommodation and improve the living conditions for his family. However, I find that the harm identified would not be outweighed by the appellant's particular circumstances and all other considerations.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR