



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2021

by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/D/21/3273653

48 Beechwood Road, Holmfield, Halifax HX2 9AR

- 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 Gaz Jones against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00012/HSE, dated 5 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2021.
 - The development is described as propose garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No 48 is a traditional stone built semi-detached dwelling located within a residential area. The dwelling is set further back from the road than the terraces to the west. Although the garage would be set back from the terraces, it would be visually associated with the host dwelling rather than the terraces. The appellant highlights that matching materials are proposed.
4. The principal elevation of the host dwelling is integral to its character and appearance. It contains architectural features which include the windows and stone detailing. Although some later additions detract from the original appearance of the building, its overall character and appearance has been maintained. The proposed garage would detract from the character and appearance of the principal elevation as it would draw the eye due to its location. Thus, the garage would be obtrusive because of its siting, in a prominent location in front of the principal elevation of the host building, and its scale.
5. On my site visit I observed that outbuildings, such as garages, in front of the principal elevation are not characteristic of the surrounding area. Consequently, the scheme would result in an incongruous, alien feature due to its siting and scale which would appear at odds with the established character of the area.
6. The terraces and the boundary treatment of both Nos 46 and 48 would largely screen the garage from wider distance views and from the adjacent public

footpath. Nevertheless, the scheme would be clearly visible from shorter distance views, especially when facing the host building from the road, because of its siting and scale.

7. The appellant highlights that the Council has approved a similar scheme and has provided a photograph. They state that since that approval there has been no change in policies and the appeal scheme is less intrusive than other approved developments. However, little information is before me with regards to that planning application and other approved developments. As stated above, outbuildings in front of principal elevations are not a common feature within the surrounding area and each application must be determined on its individual merits. The approved examples do not represent justification for harmful development at the appeal site.
8. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Replacement Calderdale Unitary Development Plan (adopted 2006, amended 2009). This Policy seeks, amongst other matters, to ensure development respects or enhances the established character and appearance of existing buildings and the surroundings and promotes a high quality of design.

Other Matters

9. The appellant states that a garage cannot be constructed to the side due to the site being a tapered piece of land. Whilst I appreciate that it would not be possible to build a garage to the side of the property, I do not consider this to be a matter which would justify harmful development at the appeal site.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations that outweigh this conflict.
11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

INSPECTOR