



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 March 2024

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 April 2024.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/24/3336857

20 Reinwood Avenue, Huddersfield, HD3 4DP

- 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 Chris Bywater against the decision of Kirklees Council.
 - The application 2023/62/93035/W, dated 10 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of single and two-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice as this is a more accurate description of the development than the one provided in the planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed single and two-storey rear extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

4. No.20 Reinwood Avenue (No.20) is a semi-detached bungalow, situated on the west side of Reinwood Avenue, with a pitched roof and front and rear dormer windows accommodating bedrooms and bathrooms in the roofspace.
5. There is an existing single-storey flat roof extension to the rear, which would be replaced with a single-storey extension of a similar width, but projecting around 4m from the rear elevation of No.20. It would have a flat roof, around 2.5m to eaves, with a central lantern rooflight. Although it would be sited on the common boundary with its paired neighbour, and would extend beyond its conservatory, in isolation, its modest dimensions mean that the single storey extension would appear a proportionate, sympathetic addition to its host.
6. Key Design Principle 2 of the Council's *House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2021)* (SPD) is that 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 details.

7. In the west corner, well offset from its paired neighbour, a two-storey extension is proposed projecting around 4m from the rear elevation of No.20 (so aligning with the proposed single-storey extension). Whilst a modest projection from the rear elevation, the extension has been designed with a flat roof that projects around 7.5m from just below the ridge of the roof of the original dwelling. Combined with its proposed width (of around 5.6m), the two-storey extension would significantly add to the bulk and massing of No.20, dominating the rear elevation. There would, therefore, be a clear conflict with the guidance at Key Design Principle 2 of the SPD.
8. Further, I observed on my site visit that whilst other dwellings on the west side of Reinwood Avenue have been extended and altered at the rear, their characteristic pitched roof (with dormers) has been retained. Although I accept that the roof form of dwellings in the wider area is varied, and the Reinwood Junior School to the west itself has a flat roof design, the proposed flat roof both exacerbates the scale of the extension and would appear out of character with its neighbours, incongruous in its context.
9. The classrooms of Reinwood Junior School are located some distance from the rear boundary of No.20, but, whilst I accept only semi-public views, the proposed two-storey extension would also appear unduly prominent from the school playing fields. It would therefore further conflict with SPD Key Design Principle 1 that extensions should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and local character of the area.
10. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed two-storey extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policy LP2 and LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan Strategy and Policies (2019) which together require development to promote good design, protect and enhance the qualities which contribute to character, and ensure that extensions are subservient to the original building, in keeping with the existing building in terms of scale. It would also conflict with the general principles of good design at Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge that the proposed extensions would provide additional living accommodation for the appellant's family, specifically bedroom space, which is a benefit of the proposal. I have also had careful regard to the personal circumstances of the appellant in terms of providing care for a family member as well as working from home. However, in this case, I do not find these matters are sufficient to outweigh the harm that the proposed two-storey extension would cause to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and wider area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR