



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 May 2024

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/24/3337263

13 West Park Street, Dewsbury, West Yorkshire WF13 4LE

- 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 Mrs Valda Maw-Day against the decision of the Kirklees Metropolitan Council.
 - The application 2023/62/93070/E dated 22 December 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as erection of rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the development was in situ. The application has been submitted retrospectively; I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
3. During my site visit I could not access the rear of the property notwithstanding this I observed the alteration to the roof from the front and side of the property. Photographs provided of the rear dormer gave me sufficient visual information to assess the scheme and formulate my decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing property and the conservation area in general.

Reasons

5. The site is within the Northfield Conservation Area. In accordance with the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; I am required to have special regard to the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the area.
6. Paragraph 205 of the Framework states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposal on such an asset. This is irrespective of the level of harm.
7. The site is a semi-detached Victorian stone-built property within a predominantly residential area. The area is characterised by large Victorian style

- properties with ornate stone detailing. Properties in the area vary in terms of design, however semi-detached properties appear to be symmetrically in design.
8. Notwithstanding this I observed during my site visit that the attached property No. 11 West Park Street had a first-floor timber extension to the front which unbalances the properties.
 9. The development has altered part of the roof from a hip to gable incorporating a larger rear dormer.
 10. The House Extensions and Alterations SPD (2021) (the SPD) highlights amongst other things that roof design plays an important role in the overall aesthetic of buildings and the surrounding streetscape. Poorly planned additions such as dormers and roof extensions can negatively impact the visual harmony of an individual property as well as the surrounding area.
 11. In this instance the development does not complement the existing architecture of the property or that of neighbouring buildings. Whilst the materials used in the hip to gable extension are sympathetic to the existing property, the alterations to the roof are incongruous to the existing property and area in general.
 12. I observed during my site visit that there have been relatively new builds and alterations to properties in the immediate area. Nevertheless, the works to create the substantial dormer are bulky and out of keeping with the existing property and conservation area in general.
 13. I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and the conservation area in general.
 14. There is conflict with Policies LP24 and LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan Strategy and Policies (2019) which seek amongst other things for developments to respect the character of the townscape and preserve the historic environment. Similarly, there is conflict with key design principles 1 and 2 of the SPD which echo the aims of Policy LP24.
 15. There is conflict with the Framework which seeks amongst other things to ensure good design of developments and protects the historic environment.

Other Matters

16. The appellant has highlighted that the proposed development is required due to the personal circumstances. I have had regard to the comments raised. Notwithstanding this these do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
17. The appellant claims that the development was completed in 2016, I have not been provided with substantive evidence to confirm this and therefore I give this limited weight.

Conclusion

18. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR