



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2025

by **Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/25/3368887

22D Howgate Road, Slaithwaite, Huddersfield HD7 5AY

- 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 and Mrs A Schofield against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Council.
 - The application reference is 2025/62/90468/W.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end terrace house of traditional style that is set back from the road behind a short front garden that is enclosed by a low-level stone wall. The dwelling has a 2-storey elevation facing Howgate Road. At the side of the main house is a single storey timber clad extension with a mono-pitched roof. The dwelling lies within a predominantly residential area wherein buildings vary in size, height, design and general appearance. Nevertheless, the properties within the same terrace as No 22D are similar in style and follow a consistent front build line.
4. The proposed front extension would be single storey and include a mono-pitched roof. It has been carefully designed with a new front door, window and external materials to match those of the host building. Nevertheless, the new addition would project noticeably forward of the main 2-storey front wall and so infill a significant portion of the front garden. By extending across almost the full width of the host building, the proposal would also be a sizeable addition.
5. By disrupting the largely flat front of the existing house, unduly disturbing the unassuming, balanced front façade of the host building, and drawing the dwelling closer to the adjacent footway, the appeal scheme would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property. As the only example of such development within the same terrace as No 22D and in the street scene to which it belongs, the proposal would draw the eye as a non-original, obtrusive and discordant element.
6. Although I saw an eclectic mix of buildings in the area surrounding the site, it is within the terrace of similar dwellings that the completed development would be

primarily seen. Additional planting to partly screen, visually soften and reinforce the separation between the new extension and the footway would not satisfactorily mitigate the harmful visual impact of the new development.

7. In reaching this conclusion, I note that the Council has recently approved a front extension to No 22D that could be introduced irrespective of the outcome of this appeal. That decision represents a realistic fallback position against which the proposal should be assessed. It also clearly establishes the principle of a front extension. From the plan extracts provided, the approved extension would be similar in depth to the proposal before me although shorter and smaller with just the entrance to the dwelling covered by new built form. As a result, the approved extension would appear less incongruous than the appeal scheme.
8. I saw that some properties in the local area include ground floor projections including those to which the appellants have referred and provided photographs. None of these examples are similar in scale, design and position to the proposal and so they do not lend significant weight in support of the appeal. I also note that the distance between the front door of a nearby property and the public footpath would be similar to that proposed in this case.
9. Nevertheless, I conclude on the main issue that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. Accordingly, it conflicts with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Key Design Principles 1 and 2 contained within the Council's House Extensions and Alterations SPD. Taken together, this policy and guidance promote good design and aim to ensure that development respects and enhances the character of the townscape and that extensions are in keeping with the existing buildings and the street scene.
10. For the same reason, the proposal is at odds with the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These policies state that development, amongst other things, should be sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of the area.
11. The proposal would make efficient use of space available at the front of the house, which the appellants regard to be unusable. Once complete, the new extension would separate the front entrance and the kitchen and provide space for a pantry. In doing so, the proposal would enhance the living conditions of the appellants. Others raise no objection. However, these considerations do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

12. Overall, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan, when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
13. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR