



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 March 2024

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 April 2024.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/23/3334986

64 Huddersfield Road, Skelmanthorpe, Huddersfield HD8 9AS

- 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 Roger Cockerham against the decision of Kirklees Council.
 - The application 2023/62/92951/E, dated 4 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear extension and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

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

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed single storey rear extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and on the living conditions of the neighbours at No.62 Huddersfield Road, with regard outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. No.64 Huddersfield Road (No.64) is a stone built, two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated to the north side of Huddersfield Road and backing onto open fields. To the side, No.64 has previously been extended over two-storeys and to the rear over single-storey, the full width of the original dwelling.
5. The guidance at Key Design Principle 2 of the *Council's House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2021)* (SPD) is 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.
6. The existing two-storey extension is offset from the principal rear elevation of No.64 and it is proposed to extend from this, projecting around 9.3m. The proposed extension would have a width of around 3.4m essentially filling the

corner between the two-storey side and single-storey rear extension, but projecting beyond the latter by around 5.5m. It would have a flat roof, and a centrally located roof lantern, with its eaves terminating just below the eaves of the shallow pitched roof of the existing single-storey rear extension.

However, despite this relatively modest height, the significant projection of the proposed extension (even from the existing rear extension), would result in an addition that appears disproportionate to the host dwelling.

7. The overall depth of the proposed extension (of around 9.3m) would be greater than the depth of the dwelling as originally built and on its own, and in combination with the previous extensions to No.64, it would unduly dominate the rear elevation of the dwelling. This would be in clear conflict with the guidance in SPD Key Design Principle 2.
8. I therefore conclude on the first main issue that the proposed single-storey rear extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. In addition to the conflict with the SPD guidance, it would conflict with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan Strategies and Policies (2019) (LP) in so far as it requires extensions to be subservient to the original building, and be in keeping with the existing building in terms of scale. It would further conflict with the principles of good design in Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework).

Living conditions

9. The existing two-storey side extension to No.64 extends up to the common boundary with its non-attached neighbour at No.62 Huddersfield Road (No.62). The proposed single-storey extension would project around 9.3m along that common boundary, above the height of the existing fenceline. It would, therefore, be clearly visible from No.62.
10. However, I observed on my site visit that No.62 itself is set well off the common boundary and has vehicular access on its opposite side, with the rear (closest to No.64) currently hardstanding, used for car parking. Whilst I recognise that this area could be used as amenity space in the future, the plot to the rear of No.62 is generous in both its depth and width. I am not, therefore, persuaded that, although visible, the proposed single-storey extension would appear overbearing or oppressive from the amenity space to the rear, such that it would cause harm to the living conditions of the neighbours at No.62.
11. Consequently, there would be no conflict with SPD Key Design Principle 6, or LP Policy LP24(c) which together require that extensions do not unduly reduce the outlook from a neighbouring property and minimise impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers. There would also be no conflict with paragraph 135 of the Framework that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion

12. Although I find no harm to the living conditions of the neighbours at No.62 Huddersfield Road, for the reasons given above, I conclude that there would be significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The appeal is therefore duly dismissed.

R Jones

INSPECTOR