



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2023

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/23/3314765

41 Moorlands Road, Birkenshaw, Bradford BD11 2BH

- 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 Alison Cheetham against the decision of Kirklees Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/62/93374/E, dated 12 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is demolition of garage and erection of two storey side extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development used in the banner heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice as it more accurately describes the proposal before me than the description provided in part 3 of the planning application form.
3. The Council has raised no issue with regard to the proposed front porch. I have no reason to disagree with that view, and I have, therefore, restricted my consideration to the proposed two-storey side extension.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed two-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host house and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. No.41 Moorlands Road (No.41) is a two-storey, semi-detached house situated on the northern side of Moorlands Road. To the side is a drive leading to a detached garage at the rear. It is proposed to demolish this garage and construct a two-storey extension to the side of the existing flank elevation.
6. Policy LP24(c) of the Kirklees Local Plan (2019) (KLP) indicates that development proposals should promote good design by ensuring that, amongst other things, extensions are subservient to the original building. The Council's *House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document* (2021) (SPD) also indicates that extensions and alterations to residential properties should not dominate the original house and two-storey extensions should be

set back at least 500mm from the front of the original house, with the ridgeline of the roof lowered.

7. The proposed extension would project around a maximum of 4.1m to the side, offset from the side boundary with its non-adjointed neighbour at No.43 Moorlands Road to allow access to the rear garden. The SPD comments that two-storey extensions can cause a negative impact on the street when used to close the gap between semi-detached houses, creating a terracing effect. In this case, however, there is a public footpath separating No.41 from its neighbour and this, combined with the offset from the side boundary, means adequate space would be retained between buildings.
8. The two-storey extension has, however, been designed such that it aligns with both the existing front and rear elevations of No.41 and continues the ridgeline of the existing hipped roof. Contrary to the guidance in the SPD, it would fail to provide any vertical break in the roof plane and would result in scale and massing of extension that would unnecessarily compete with the host house. Although I find the width acceptable, in combination with this lack of set back and set down, I find the extension would appear as a dominant, incongruous addition which would fail to appear subservient to No.41.
9. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposed two-storey side extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of its host and the wider area. Consequently, it conflicts with KLP Policy 24(c) and fails to follow the guidance within the SPD and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). Together, these promote good design by ensuring that proposals respect and enhance local character; and that house extensions enhance the appearance of an area and are subservient to the original building.

Other Matters

10. I note that the appellant has provided examples of extensions allowed in the area, which are built flush with the front elevation and which have continued the ridgeline of the house. However, from the limited information before me it appears that these examples pre-date the current SPD which was adopted in June 2021. Further, I observed other examples of side extensions, notably at No.45 Moorlands Road, where there is a degree of set back and set down, and I found the relationship between these and their host houses to be more successful than the examples provided by the appellant. The examples provided by the appellant should not, therefore, be viewed as appropriate precedents and I have, therefore, considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Jones

INSPECTOR