



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 17 August 2021

by F Wilkinson BSc (Hons), MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/21/3274445

8 White Rose Avenue, Dalton, Huddersfield, West Yorkshire HD5 9UE

- 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 Yasin Mohammed against the decision of Kirklees Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/62/93822/W, dated 6 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single and two storey extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Following the submission of the appeal a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. Whilst some content has been added and the paragraph numbers changed, the substance of the Framework in regard to the main issue of the case has not. I have taken the revised Framework into account in my decision, and I am satisfied that this has not prejudiced either party.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a modest two storey semi detached dwelling with rendered walls and a concrete tile roof, located within a mainly residential area. Although there is some slight variations in design, the majority of dwellings in the area are of a similar character and scale.
5. The proposed two storey rear extension would project out from the side elevation of the host dwelling. It would be therefore visible from certain locations on White Rose Avenue as well as being clearly visible from Kelso Grove to the rear.
6. The offset design of the two storey extension would not relate well to the host dwelling. When viewed from White Rose Avenue, the two storey extension would appear as part of the roof of the host dwelling, but given its lower height and gable design, it would give an awkward and much bulkier appearance to the roof form. When viewed from the rear, the offset design would increase the visual scale and mass of the proposed two storey extension. It would therefore

appear as a prominent addition that would not be subservient to the host building.

7. Consequently, whilst I note that the materials would match the existing dwelling, given the offset design, the two storey extension would appear as a dominant and incongruous feature on the host dwelling and surrounding area that would be significantly harmful to their character and appearance. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan Strategy and Policies, adopted 2019, which requires the form, scale, layout and details of development to respect and enhance the character of the townscape and for extensions to be subservient to the original building and be in keeping with existing buildings in terms of scale, amongst other matters. It would also conflict with the design objectives of the Framework.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of examples of dwellings in the vicinity that have similar two storey rear extensions to the appeal scheme. I noted when on site that, although the properties identified by the appellant do have two storey rear extensions of a similar design to the proposed development, these extensions do not project beyond the side elevation of the host dwellings, which is not the case with the proposed development. I have accordingly considered the appeal scheme on its own merits.
9. The Council has not raised a concern about the principle of the proposed development, the effect on occupiers of neighbouring properties or highway safety and there have been no objections from neighbouring residents. However, none of these matters alters or outweighs the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no relevant material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, and for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

F Wilkinson

INSPECTOR