



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by **P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/25/3373575

4 South View, Savile Town, Kirklees, Dewsbury WF12 9LE

- 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 Liaqat Ali against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/62/91341/E.
 - The development proposed is proposed second floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed second floor extension at 4 South View, Savile Town, Kirklees, Dewsbury WF12 9LE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/62/91341/E, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan and Existing Floor Plans, Proposed Floor Plans, Existing and Proposed Front and Rear Elevations, Existing and Proposed Side Elevations.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a stone built 2 storey mid terraced house with a narrow frontage which faces towards a central parking area beyond which are the rear of houses on Carlton Terrace. South View is one of several residential streets of similarly designed houses that branch off Thornhill Street, including Thornleigh, Hodgson Terrace and Clarence Terrace. Many houses on these roads have been extended upwards to create a third storey with a pitched roof, to the extent that such extensions are common enough to have become characteristic of the street scene in the area surrounding the appeal site. Also, most of the roofs on the rear of houses on Carlton Terrace and Thornhill Street which face towards, and are visible

from, the appeal property, have been extended either with substantial rear dormers or by raising the roof to add another storey.

4. The proposed development would raise the roof on the appeal property to add a third storey. The materials would match the existing stonework, and the windows would be in line with those on the first floor. I appreciate that of the 16 houses in the terrace only 4 have been similarly extended, but in the context of similar extensions within the area, and in particular the immediate street scene that I have described, the proposed development would not be out of keeping.
5. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would not conflict with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan (2019), Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the House Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2021) and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which require development to respect the character of the townscape and be in keeping with existing buildings.

Other Matters

6. I have had regard to the appeal decision referred to by the council¹ relating to a proposal at 72 Savile Road, in which the Inspector found that roof extensions did not represent the predominant character of the area and that the proposed scheme would therefore have been out of character. I have not been provided with the details of that scheme to assess whether it is comparable to the appeal proposal before me. Nonetheless, I visited the site and note that roof extensions, particularly on the front of properties, are not common on Savile Road. That is not the case in the area surrounding the appeal site, as noted above.
7. In terms of objections to the appeal proposal from a neighbouring occupier, matters relating to construction times and debris during construction were addressed in the council's officer report. The council concluded that these matters were not material and there are no reasons to support a different conclusion.

Conclusion and Conditions

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
9. I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/24/3354710