The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2023

by E Worthington BA (Hons) MTP MUED MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/23/3323297
2 Green Gardens, Golcar, Kirklees, Huddersfield, HD7 4DG

- 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 Mr B Good against the decision of Kirklees Council.
- The application Ref 2023/62/90680/W, dated 1 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2023.
- The development proposed is described as 'proposed extensions'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling in a residential area. It already has a number of existing extensions including a two storey rear extension, a two storey side extension, and a single storey rear extension. A large detached garage is also located to the dwelling's western side. Sited on the end of a row of similar mainly semi-detached dwellings the appeal property occupies a corner plot between Intake and Green Gardens.

4. The proposed two storey side extension would encapsulate the property's existing two storey side addition and extend the full width of the side elevation with an overall depth of some 9.8 metres. It would project around 4 metres from the property's original side elevation, and some 2.5 metres from the flank wall of its two storey rear extension element. The proposed extension would result in a new flush side elevation where two pitched roof gable end features would be introduced. Whilst the larger element towards the front of the dwelling would be taller, both gables would have ridge lines which would sit below the height of the existing roof lines.

5. The Council accepts that the proposal would comply with a number of the requirements for two storey side extensions set out in its House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Notably, it would retain a gap to the side boundary, be set down from the roof ridges of the host property, incorporate a similar roof style and pitch, and appear only around 2/3 the size of the property's front elevation when viewed from the front.

6. The appellant argues that the proposed design would consolidate the existing poorly designed bolted on incremental extensions and I acknowledge that it would provide a more holistic and integrated approach to the dwelling. I also accept that the appeal property occupies a relatively generous corner plot. Additionally, I have had regard to the appellant's argument that the existing development on the site only covers 30% of the site area, and that the proposal would increase this to only 35%.

7. Nevertheless, the proposed extension would be considerable in size and would add further to a dwelling which has already been substantially altered and enlarged. Whilst the rear elevation and much of the side elevation of the original house are already obscured by the existing extensions, the proposal would conceal what remains of the property's original side elevation. It would introduce two tall and bulky gable ended elements to the side of the building and in doing so would present a complicated roof arrangement and design.

8. This being so, in combination with the existing extensions, the proposal would unduly dominate and visually swamp the house and would fail to appear subservient to it. In altering the proportions and overwhelming the appearance of what would have formerly been a relatively modest host building, the proposal would further diminish any understanding of its original design and character. Thus, I find that it would be appreciated as an unsympathetic and discordant addition to the dwelling.

9. As set out above, the appeal property occupies a highly visible and prominent corner position and is adjacent to open space and a public footpath. Despite the size of the plot, the proposal would bring two storey development closer to the property's western boundary and to its garage. In doing so it would further increase the amount of development on the site and reduce the space to the side of it. This would make the site appear less spacious and more cramped. As a result, the appeal property would look noticeably bigger than the other more modest properties nearby and out of step with the scale of the surrounding development. In this context the proposal would be incongruous in the street scene.

10. The Council is also concerned about the proposed use of render to the side elevation. Whilst the appellant agrees to a condition requiring the use of cast stone as an alternative, this does not alter my concerns in relation to the proposal's unsatisfactory visual impact as described above.

11. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. This would be contrary to Policy LP2 of the Kirklees Local Plan (Local Plan) which sets out that development should seek to build on strengths, opportunities and help to address the challenges identified in the Local Plan.

12. The proposal would also fail to support Local Plan Policy LP24 which advises that proposals should promote good design by ensuring the form, scale, layout and details of all development respects and enhances the character of the townscape (a), and that extensions are subservient to the original building, and are inkeeping with the existing buildings in terms of scale, materials and details (c).

13. Furthermore, the proposal would be at odds with SPD Key Principle 1 which states that extensions and alterations to residential properties should be inkeeping with the appearance, scale, design and local character of the area and the street scene. It would also conflict with SPD Key Principle 2 which advises that extensions should not dominate or be larger than the original house and should be inkeeping with the existing building in terms of scale, materials and detail.

14. Additionally, the proposal would conflict with the aim of paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which indicates that decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Other matters

15. The proposal would allow the reconfiguration of the appeal property's internal space to tie in the previous extensions and maximise unusable spaces both internally and externally. It would provide a more practical layout for a growing family with changing needs who are deeply rooted in the area. These are benefits of the proposal and count in its favour. However, they are insufficient to outweigh the harm that would arise in relation to the main issue as described above.

16. The appellant refers to an extant permission for a single storey side extension. I understand that this would not be capable of implementation if the appeal scheme were to be allowed. Whilst no further details of this have been provided, since that permission relates to a single storey addition, it would not be as substantial as the proposal before me. Therefore, this potential fallback position does not justify the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all the other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Worthington

INSPECTOR