



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2025 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/25/3364837

5 Dearnfield, Upper Cumberworth, Huddersfield, Kirklees HD8 8NX

- 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 & Mrs Simon Facey against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/62/93470/E.
 - The development proposed is described as “The construction of a two storey side extension, a single storey rear extension and a first floor above an existing garage”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issues

3. Whilst the proposed east elevation does not show a rear set back on the side extension, it is shown on others. The plans I have before me are sufficient to make an assessment of the effects of the scheme in the context of the main issues. In addition, the Council does not object to the single storey rear extension, and I find no reason to disagree. My recommendation therefore focusses on the two storey and first floor side elements. The main issues in regard to which is their effect on a) the character and appearance of the area; and b) the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 6 Dearnfield (No. 6) with specific regard to light and outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal building is a two storey detached property, with a side garage and spacious front and rear gardens. It is located within a cul-de-sac, on a prominent corner plot that has an elevated position at a three-way junction. The street scene features a mix of bungalows and detached two storey dwellings, varied in design, materials and roof forms. However, and within the cul-de-sac, the appeal building is one of three detached properties of the same architectural style, with each presenting a gable end as the principal elevation. These dwellings have been minimally extended, preserving their original form. As such, and despite the surrounding architectural variety, this group retains a collective identity and strong

coherence, which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

5. The appeal scheme would use matching materials and have an overall height lower than the main roof. However, this would not achieve a fully subordinate appearance, as the host dwelling would be flanked by a two storey extension to one side, with a first floor extension to the other. The proposal would also be flush with the front elevation, resulting in a continuous and bulky massing. Whilst the surrounding area includes some detached properties with wide frontages, the appeal building presents a narrower façade due to the gable end. The proposed extensions would, therefore, appear as dominating and disproportionate additions. They would also be out of scale with the original dwelling and disrupt the original consistency of the group of three dwellings within the cul-de-sac. Their imposing presence would be further emphasised by the appeal site's prominent and elevated positioning.
6. Moreover, the proposal involves a combination of a catslide roof set below the main eaves to one side and a pitched roof to the other. This would result in an overall unbalanced and incongruous composition, when viewed against the original dwelling. Whilst there are a range of roof types in the area, which include catslide examples, these are typically of an original architecture and do not form as a prevalent feature.
7. For these reasons, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan 2019 (KLP), Key Design Principle (KDP) 1 and 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2021 (SPD) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Together, and amongst other things, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that extensions and alterations respect the scale, design, and character of the original building and surrounding area.

Living Conditions

8. The proposed first floor side extension would be sited close to the shared side boundary with No. 6. However, its roof would sit below the main eaves and would include a first floor set back to the rear. It would also be contained within the footprint of the existing garage and the appeal building has an angled orientation, which increases the separation away from No. 6. Whilst the appeal site occupies higher ground, given the proposed extension's lower height, recessed massing and positioning, it would not result in a significant reduction of light, nor would it appear as an oppressive addition from No. 6's garden areas. Moreover, No. 6 benefits from a south-facing rear garden within a relatively long and narrow plot. Therefore, whilst some overshadowing would occur during late afternoon, ample light would still be received throughout the day. Unincumbered garden views would also still be maintained for No. 6.
9. For these reasons, the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 6 with specific regard to light and outlook. Accordingly, it would not conflict with Policy LP24 of the KLP, KDP 5 and 6 of the SPD and the Framework. Together, and amongst other things, these seek for extensions and alterations to minimise impact on residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers, ensuring that no significant loss of natural light or outlook occurs.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. Whilst I have found in the appellant's favour on the second main issue, this would be a neutral matter and not be capable of weighing against the harm I have found in regard to the first. Material considerations do not indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan, with which the scheme would conflict for the reasons I have set out. I therefore recommend the appeal should be dismissed.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR