



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2023

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/23/3325541
72 Meltham Road, Honley, Holmfirth HD9 6HL

- 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 Steve Donlon against the decision of Kirklees Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/62/91184/W, dated 19 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side and rear and single storey rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side and rear and single storey rear extensions at 72 Meltham Road, Honley, Holmfirth HD9 6HL in accordance with the terms of the application, 2023/62/91184/W, dated 19 April 2023, and the plans submitted with it, 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: Existing and Proposed Site Plans. Drawing No. 01. Revision B; Existing Floor and Roof Plans. Drawing No. 02. Revision B; Existing Elevation Plans. Drawing No. 03. Revision: B; Proposed Floor and Roof Plans. Drawing No. 04. Revision: B; and Proposed Elevation Plans. Drawing No. 05. Revision B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice as it is a more accurate description of the development before me than the description provided in the planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host house and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. No.72 Meltham Road (No.72) is a two-storey, semi-detached house located on the north side of Meltham Road. I observed on my site visit that the north side of Meltham Road is characterised by pairs of semi-detached houses which have a cohesive appearance in terms of their stone construction, ground floor bay windows and hipped roof with red ridge tiles. Many have, however, been altered and some extended to the side, with garages and outbuildings set back behind driveways. No.72's attached neighbour at No.74 Meltham Road (No.74) has already been extended over two-storeys to the side (and rear).
5. To the side of No.72 is an existing lean-to single storey extension clad in timber, with wraps around the rear of the house, and a driveway to an outbuilding set well back in the garden. It is proposed to demolish the existing extension and construct a two-storey extension which would project around 2.15m to the side, continuing the existing front building line, offset by just over 1m from the boundary with the non-attached neighbour at No.70 Meltham Road allowing access to be retained to the garden.
6. The guidance in the Council's *House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document* (2021) (SPD) is that two-storey extensions should not take up all or most of the space to the side of the house; should maintain a 1m gap to the side boundary; and be set back at least 500mm from the front wall of the house. The proposed side extension would fill much of the space to the side of No.72, has not been set back from the front wall, nor has the ridgeline been lowered. There is clearly therefore a conflict with the SPD guidance, where it relates to two-storey extension.
7. In this case, however, the extension has been designed to reflect the existing extension to No.74 (No.72's attached neighbour) in terms of its building line and roof form, and consequently it would appear an appropriate and sympathetic addition to its semi-detached pair and the wider streetscene. To meet the specific SPD guidance for two-storey extensions would result in a design that would unbalance this pair to the detriment of its character and appearance. The Council themselves recognise (in the Delegated Report) that the side extension could, in isolation, potentially be acceptable given the extension to the attached neighbour, preventing an unbalanced and visual inharmonious design.
8. Further, because No.72 (and No.74) is set at a slightly elevated position to its non-attached neighbour at No.70, itself set off the boundary by around 2.4m, adequate space between buildings would be retained, consistent with the objective of the SPD guidance. I therefore find no conflict with Key Design Principle 1 of the SPD because the appearance, scale and design of the extension would be in keeping with the local character of the area.
9. The proposed side extension projects rearwards by around 7.8m and wraps around the rear elevation of No.72 (over two-storeys) projecting around 1.9m from the existing rear elevation across its full width. A single storey extension (again across the full width) would project beyond this, so a total of around 4.6m from the original (non-extended) house. This combined projection would exceed the SPD guidance that single and two-storey rear extensions should only project 3m for semi-detached houses. It is accepted that because the rear extension would be across the full width of No.72 (unlike the rear extension to No.74 which has been offset from the boundary) it would obscure the existing

rear wall of the host house. Both the proposed single and two-storey extension would, however, be finished in stone with a simple hipped roof design, which rather than appearing complicated or incongruous would be sympathetic to the design and form of the host. Although reasonable in scale, I do not find the proposed extensions (in combination) to be disproportionate to the original house and garden. Whilst there would clearly be some conflict with parts of the SPD guidance, there would be no conflict with Key Design Principle 2 which states that extensions should not dominate or be larger than the original house and should be in keeping with the existing building in terms of scale, materials and details.

10. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposals would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host house or wider streetscene. Consequently, there would be no conflict with Policy LP24 (a) and (c) of the Kirklees Local Plan Strategy and Policies (2019), Policy 2 of the made Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan (2021) or Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which together, amongst other things, require development to be of a form, design and detail that respects the character of townscape and local distinctiveness and is in keeping with the existing building.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time condition, I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also included a condition in relation to materials in order to provide a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR