
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2025

by **L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/24/3355767

95 Firthcliffe Parade, Littletown, Liversedge WF15 6AW

- 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 Mrs Nazia Hussain against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/62/92263/E.
 - The development proposed is a part-two, part-single storey rear extension and two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two-storey, side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No 95 is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located within a residential area. The surrounding area is characterised by similarly designed dwellings. Dwellings have gaps to the side which results in a regular street scene and provides a sense of space which is important to the character of the area.
4. Two-storey, side extensions are not a common feature within the street scene. The few that I observed on my site visit were generally situated on corner plots and where a gap to the side of the dwelling was maintained. It has also been drawn to my attention that they were constructed prior to the adoption of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD (2021) (SPD). Furthermore, the extension's highlighted by the appellant are located some distance from the appeal site and do not form part of the street scene.
5. Key Design Principle 1 of the SPD states extensions should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and local character of the area and the street scene. Furthermore, Key Design Principle 2 states 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 detail.
6. The extension would not comply with the SPD as it would not maintain a 1 metre gap to the side boundary. The two-storey, side extension would fill the gap to the side which would erode the sense of space and rhythm of the area. By reason of the extension's scale, design and siting, it would be a discordant and incongruous addition which would fail to respect or enhance the form and layout of the

surrounding area, and would detract from the host building. The appellant highlights that the development would provide much needed additional living space, but that would not outweigh the harm I have found.

7. For these reasons, the proposed two-storey, side extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan: Strategy and Policies (2019). This seeks, amongst other things, to promote good design by ensuring extensions are subservient to the original building, are in keeping with the existing buildings as well as ensuring it respects and enhances the character of the townscape. In addition, it would conflict with chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states developments should be sympathetic to local character, and the aforementioned SPD key design principles.

Conclusion

8. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Consequently, the appeal does not succeed.

L Wilson

INSPECTOR