



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2022

by Diane Cragg Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/22/3290900

10 Haughs Green, Pike Law Road, Scapegoat Hill, Huddersfield HD7 4NF

- 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 Ms M Gilling against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/62/93069/W, dated 30 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey front extension with associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt. The Council considers that the appeal scheme would not represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and I have no reason to take a different view.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. No 10 Haughs Green is part of a stone built two storey terraced row of three properties, located at an angle to and elevated above Pike Law Road. No 10, formerly three terraced properties, is adjacent to open paddock land to the side and rear with its garden area adjacent to the front elevation.
5. No 10 and its attached neighbours form a terraced row with strong linear form and attractive stonework which is also characteristic of the older surrounding properties.
6. The extension would be single storey and would cover the existing main entrance to No 10. It is designed with an oak frame, stone walls with quoin stone detail and gable roof. The drawings indicate that the extension width would be comparable with the original end terraced house, but the proposed elevational treatment does not relate well to the vertical arrangement of the existing windows and, together with the eaves line and gutter detail, would tend to give the extension a wider appearance.

7. Despite the various extensions and garages to the adjacent properties there is a consistency and uniformity to the terraced row in its linear form, the stonework and the arrangement and detailing of the windows. The proposed front extension, including the oak frame, the width of the structure and the double door opening to the front elevation, when viewed in conjunction with the rest of the dwelling and the remainder of the terraced row, would be noticeably dissimilar in character and appearance. When seen in its elevated and prominent context the extension would appear incongruous and would not be in keeping with or respect the street scene.
8. For these reasons, the proposed development would detract from the character and appearance of the host property and the area in conflict with Policies LP1, LP2, LP24 and LP57 of the Kirklees Local Plan Strategy and Policies adopted February 2019 where these policies seek to enhance places and have regard to the scale and character of the existing building. It would also conflict with the House Extensions and Alterations SPD (SPD) June 2021 where the general design principles seek design appropriate to the local character and the street scene, and in keeping with the existing building in terms of scale. It would also conflict with the SPD where it seeks to ensure that single storey front extensions would be well-designed and would not harm the character of the original house or the area.
9. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks to ensure that development would add to the overall quality of the area and be sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR