



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2022

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/22/3304949

168 Reinwood Road, Quarmby, Huddersfield HD3 4DW

- 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 Murray Smith against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/62/91227/W, dated 25 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension forming storage area, dining room extension, two bedrooms and small decking to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Reinwood Road comprises a wide variety of dwelling types, which are typically set back from the road with spaces between buildings. No. 168 is situated within a row of six semi-detached houses of almost identical appearance. These buildings are sited at slightly splayed angles following the bend of the road and all have hipped roofs. Both of these factors increase the sense of space between the buildings, which makes a positive contribution to the area.
4. Due to the topography of the area the appeal property is higher than neighbouring No. 170 and the ground floor level of the houses is notably higher than the road. Consequently, the side elevation of the appeal property is visually prominent in the street scene.
5. The width of the proposed two-storey side extension would be approximately half the width of the original dwelling at the front. It would be flush with the front of the house and would have matching eaves and ridge height. However, the proposed gable roof would approximately triple the length of the ridge line of the dwelling. The bulk and form of the proposed gable roof would significantly unbalance the symmetry of this pair of hipped roof dwellings. This together with the increased mass of stonework created by the visually prominent gable wall, would appear incongruous in the street scene, detracting from the appearance of this row of semi-detached houses and the spaces between them.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area contrary to policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan Strategy and Policies Document (adopted 27 February 2019), which requires amongst other things, that the form, scale and details of all development respects and enhances the character of the townscape and that extensions are in keeping with existing buildings. The proposed development would also conflict with guidance contained in the Council's adopted House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework. These are material considerations, which advise amongst other things that new development should be sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

7. I acknowledge the appellant's desire to meet the increasing needs of his family, whilst retaining a good size rear garden with improved security. I also accept that a gable roof may be easier to maintain than a hipped roof with gutters up to the site boundary. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified and could be achieved in other ways.

Conclusion

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

R Bartlett

INSPECTOR