



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2022

by M L Milliken BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/21/3283629

15 Dorchester Road, Fixby, Huddersfield HD2 2JZ

- 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 Tony Sandhu against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/62/90775/W, dated 24 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as '*Two and a half storey side extension*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located along a row of large, detached properties, that appear to benefit from generous plot sizes and spacious gardens.
4. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would be constructed using sympathetic materials to match the existing dwelling. However, its scale and size would subsume the existing property resulting in it appearing overly large within the street scene. This dominance would be further exacerbated by the size and quantum of the proposed dormer windows, which would result in a proposed extension which would appear dominant and incongruous against the existing property and the street scene, not rendering it to be subservient to the host property.
5. The appellant has drawn my attention to local examples of planning approvals for extensions, however I consider that these are not directly comparable, principally in terms of the scale of the development proposed. I therefore attribute minimal weight to these examples in the consideration of this appeal.
6. For the reasons given, the proposed development would not accord with Parts (a) and (c) of Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan (KLP) (adopted February 2019), which seek to ensure good design with regards to the form, scale and layout of all development, so that it respects and enhances the character of the townscape, and that extensions are subservient to the original building, are in keeping with existing buildings in terms of scale,

materials and details and minimise impact on the residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers. For the same reasons the proposed extension would not accord with Paragraph 4.5 of the Council's House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) (adopted June 2021), which advises that extensions should normally be smaller in scale than the original property and set back from the existing building line, that two-storey extensions should be set down from the ridge line and generally smaller in footprint and that the materials, design, roof pitch and detailing should normally match the existing house detailing.

7. It would also conflict with Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment. At paragraph 134, the Framework advises that development that is not well designed should be refused.
8. I therefore consider that the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the street scene and would therefore conflict with Parts (a) and (c) of Policy LP24 of the KLP (2019) and the Council's SPD (2021), details of which I have outlined above. It would also conflict with relevant paragraphs of the Framework as stated.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out, I conclude the proposed development to be in conflict with the development plan as a whole, and that finding is not outweighed by other material considerations. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

M L Milliken

INSPECTOR