



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2022

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/22/3297623

8 Jersey Close, Dewsbury WF12 7EU

- 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 and Mrs D Flowers against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/62/90112/E, dated 26 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single- and two-storey side extension and associated works at 8 Jersey Close, Dewsbury WF12 7EU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2022/62/90112/E, dated 26 June 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Location Plan
 - Block Plan
 - 21/112 Existing Plans (May 2021)
 - 21/112 Proposed Extn (May 2021)
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form, as is usual. An alternative description was used on the Council's decision notice, and subsequently by the appellant on the appeal form; I have used that in my formal decision as it provides a more detailed and accurate description of the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. No 8 Jersey Close is at the end of a short terrace of three two-storey houses, close to the head of a short cul-de-sac of similar properties. The wider area is predominantly residential, although most of the houses and bungalows nearby are semi-detached rather than in terraces. The housing in the area is generally modest in scale, style and detailing, although overwhelmingly neat and well cared-for in appearance. The gaps between blocks – whether terraces or semi-detached pairs – allow for views through to the back of houses on adjoining streets or, in some cases, of trees and mature vegetation in rear gardens. This gives the area a pleasant and spacious character, which is often particularly evident where the blocks are angled around street corners or within cul-de-sacs.
5. The appeal property already has a side extension, which has filled in much of the space between the original house and No 6 next door. Essentially, it is a two-storey irregular trapezium-shaped addition to the side of the original building, with additional ground floor space (including a garage and utility rooms) wrapped around the side and rear of the property. The angled side facing No 6 has a gable roof. The proposed development would infill a small area on the ground floor, where the garage door is currently at an angle to and set back from the main front elevation, and the interior would be reconfigured to provide an enlarged kitchen and dining room. At first-floor level, the existing trapezium-shaped bedroom would be squared off, to create an enlarged bedroom with ensuite bathroom. The roof would be reconfigured to have a hipped, rather than gable-ended, form.
6. The Council's 2021 *House Extensions and Alterations* Supplementary Planning Document ("the SPD") provides guidance to help ensure that extensions are well-designed and contribute to the quality of the area. Principle 1 of the SPD is that extensions should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of the local area and streetscene. The SPD also advises that two-storey and first-floor side extensions can have a negative impact when they close a gap between adjacent buildings. The Council's primary objection to the appeal proposal is that the extension, particularly the first-floor element, would reduce (and effectively remove the) gap between No 8 and No 6. It considers that the terracing effect which would be created by the increased massing would be harmful to the character of the streetscene.
7. As I have described in paragraph 4 above, I agree that the gaps which are found between many adjoining pairs of blocks are a positive feature of the area, and make a significant contribution to its pleasant character and appearance. However, in this case, the gap between No 8 and No 6 has already been significantly reduced by the existing extension to the appeal property. On entering Jersey Close from Alderney Road, I saw that that initially there is no visual gap between the pair, and there is already a terracing effect. That there may be a gap at all only begins to become apparent approximately halfway up Jersey Close, although from this point the angular side extension and its gable wall still dominates the view. It is only in very limited views from close to the head of the cul-de-sac that any form of gap can really be appreciated.
8. The proposed first-floor extension would undoubtedly reduce the physical gap between No 8 and No 6 still further. However, given the existing spatial relationship and the significant terracing effect which already exists between

the two properties (which is certainly unique within Jersey Close, and based on what I saw appears rare within the wider neighbourhood), as well as the fact that the further reduction in the gap would only be observed from a very small part of Jersey Close, I consider that in this case the proposed extension would not cause significant harm to the streetscape. Indeed, replacing the existing awkward and angular extension and gable roof with a more regular, hipped roof extension would give the appeal property a form more in keeping with its neighbours.

9. The Council found the proposal to be acceptable in principle, considered that it would be subservient to the host dwelling and of appropriate matching materials, and that there would be no significant adverse effects on neighbours' living conditions (as sought by the SPD). None of the evidence before me, or what I saw on site, leads me to a different view on any of these points.
10. I conclude that the proposed extension would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. The development would therefore comply with Policy LP24 of the 2019 Kirklees Local Plan, which among other things requires development to be well-designed and respect the character of the townscape. For the same reasons, the proposal complies with the aims of Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework" in respect of achieving well-designed places.
11. The decision notice also indicated conflict with the provisions of Chapter 15 of the Framework. That part of the Framework addresses conserving and enhancing the natural environment, although none of the evidence before explains where any such conflict might arise. Accordingly I also find no conflict with the Framework in this respect.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans so as to provide certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area I have also imposed a condition requiring external surfaces of the permitted extension to be of materials matching the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

13. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Cryan

Inspector