



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 March 2024

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13.03.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/23/3333887

7 Bradley Grange Gardens, Bradley, Huddersfield HD2 1QX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Naveed against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Council.
 - The application Ref is 2023/62/91718/W.
 - The development proposed is side front and rear extensions and extended dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling sits amongst other detached dwellings which all front onto Bradley Grange Gardens. As the road rises up, the dwellings on this side of it are staggered back to varying degrees behind relatively large and generally open frontage areas, creating a visually coherent and spacious feel and giving the dwellings a prominence within the street scene. Whilst of a different design to the two dwellings either side of it, the appeal property nonetheless shares a simple and unfussy design ethos that is characteristic of the wider street scene. These factors collectively make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
4. The proposal would introduce a two-storey gable that would project considerably forward of the existing front elevation. It would project to the same distance as the front elevation of 5 Bradley Grange Gardens, thus substantially compromising the staggered arrangement and rhythm that presently exists, an impact which would be particularly noticeable in views taken down the road. A front projecting gable would not be characteristic of the appeal dwelling as it exists and whilst other dwellings on this side of the road have asymmetrical gables these are intrinsic parts of the design of their front elevations. Furthermore, the gable projection would be large in size, visually dominant and not be subservient in its relationship to the host property.
5. It would for these reasons appear as an incongruous and discordant addition to the host dwelling, resulting in significant harm to its character and appearance and to that of the surrounding street scene. Whilst I acknowledge there is a dwelling opposite the site which has been extended with a projecting front

gable, that gable appears to project a lesser distance from the front elevation, and it does not project as far as the front elevation of the adjacent dwelling. But in any event, its visual relationship to its original dwelling and overall visual impact do not lend support for the proposition that the appeal proposal should be permitted, and it is an isolated case in the immediate street scene which contributes little to its character and appearance as a result.

6. The Council further makes reference to the fact that the ridge height of the proposed development would not be set down from the ridge height of the existing dwelling. They raise concern that this would serve to add to the visual non-subserviency of what is proposed in comparison to the original dwelling. However, given the scale and impact of the front gable projection and the harm that I have found that this would cause, setting down the ridge would have done little to bring about any degree of visual subservience to the development. Nor would it have addressed the concerns as to the visual impact that the proposal would have as a whole.
7. In conclusion therefore, the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, it would fail to accord with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan Strategy and Policies 2019 where it seeks to protect character and appearance and to promote good design. There would also be a conflict with the aims of KDP1 and KDP2 of the House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2021 in the same regard, and with the National Planning Policy Framework where it aims to achieve well-designed and beautiful places.

Other Matters

8. I acknowledge that the proposed development is intended to provide additional accommodation for the appellant and their family. Whilst I am sympathetic to the need for this additional space, it does not justify the permitting of a harmful development.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR