



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 2 June 2021

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/D/20/3263963

12 Colden Close, Hebden Bridge HX7 6DY

- 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 & Mrs Moon against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00883/HSE, dated 28 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'single storey rear extension, loft conversion, front dormer and rear dormer constructed under permitted development'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed front dormer on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No 12 Colden Close is a semi-detached dwelling situated on a residential cul-de-sac characterised by three-storey dwellings. The dwellings on Colden Close are of a distinct style with shared characteristics including similar fenestration to their front elevations and gable-sided pitched roofs with no front dormers. I noted on my site visit that the roof forms of other buildings in the area are also predominantly pitched.
4. The flat roofed front dormer window would appear significantly at odds with the plain pitched roof forms of the dwellings on Colden Close and the mainly traditional built form of the local vernacular. The introduction of this window at roof level would also visually unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings that No 12 forms part of. The position of the host dwelling at the head of the cul-de-sac means that the front dormer would be prominent in views from the entrance to Colden Close on the A646. Even if materials to match the existing dwelling were incorporated, this would not assimilate the incongruous form of the flat roofed front dormer into its surroundings.
5. My attention has been drawn to recent planning approvals for front dormers elsewhere in the District. I am not aware of the full details of the examples given. In any case, this does not persuade me that the site-specific harm that I have identified would be justified.
6. I conclude, the proposed front dormer would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, the development would conflict with Policy BE1 (General Design Criteria) of the Replacement

Calderdale Unitary Development Plan (2006) which amongst other things requires that development proposals respect or enhance the established character and appearance of existing buildings.

Other Matter

7. The planning application was refused specifically in respect of the potential impact of the proposed front dormer. From what I have seen, I find no reason to disagree with the Council that the other elements of the proposal, raise no material planning concerns. Even so, this does not overcome the harm that I have identified under the main issue.

Conclusion

8. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR