

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2020

by R Walker BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/D/20/3255512

Highroyd House, Greetland Road, Barkisland, Sowerby Bridge HX4 0DE

- 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 M Bolger against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00158/HSE, dated 11 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is front dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a slightly different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application which accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The site is within the Green Belt. The Council conclude that the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Having regard to the exceptions set out in paragraph 145 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I agree. It would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. Thus, the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
4. Accordingly, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene within Greetland Road.

Reasons

5. The appeal building is a traditional farmhouse with an attached barn. At the time of my site visit I saw that works are being undertaken to both the farmhouse and barn and I note the planning history at the site. The appeal building is located immediately fronting onto the road and opposite the junction to Jackson Lane. With no immediate neighbouring properties either side, it is prominent in the street scene.

6. The proposed dormer would occupy a sizeable proportion of the front roof slope of the original farmhouse and would be a dominant feature. Although positioned in the middle of the roof slope, it would not align well with the windows below, giving it a discordant appearance. The combination of its size and position would contrast with the architectural simplicity of the host building's front elevation.
7. I did not see any other examples of dormers on the front roof slopes within the street. Although I note that the host property has dormers to the rear, these are not prominent in the street scene. In my view, given the prominence of the front elevation and my findings above, the proposal would appear incongruous on the host property.
8. I therefore find that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene within Greetland Road. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Replacement Calderdale Unitary Development Plan (adopted 2006). This stipulates, amongst other things, that development proposals should make a positive contribution to the quality of the existing environment, or, at the very least, maintain that quality by means of high standards of design. It would also conflict with the Framework at paragraph 124 and 127, which broadly seek to secure high quality design.
9. I recognise that extending the property might meet the appellant's need for increased accommodation and the appellant has sought to work with the Council, reducing the size of the dormer following discussions. However, personal circumstances will seldom outweigh more general planning concerns and these considerations do not outweigh the harm that I have identified from the proposed dormer to the character and appearance of the host property and street scene within Greetland Road.
10. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

Robert Walker

INSPECTOR