



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 2 July 2021

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/D/21/3271792

2 Carr Green Close, Rastrick, Brighouse HD6 3LX

- 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 John Cunnington against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01147/HSE, dated 28 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a two storey side extension and single storey to rear forming garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 20 July 2021, the Government published its revised National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'). It replaces the previous version published in February 2019. The Framework represents the Government's up-to-date planning policies for England and how they should be applied.
3. The circumstances of this appeal are such that it has not been necessary to seek comments from the parties on the revised Framework.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. It is situated in a predominantly residential area, at the entrance to a cul-de-sac where owing to a slight incline of the street, it is rather prominent in the street-scene. It has a large driveway to the front and a detached double garage that is set back and to the side of the main part of the dwelling. The proposed extension would involve the demolition of the existing garage.
6. Although the proposed extension would be set back from the main building line of the dwelling, and incorporate a dropped ridge, its overall width, being greater than the main part of the dwelling, and mass, would result in it dominating the property and appearing incongruous. The differing levels between the main part of the dwelling and the site of the proposed extension

would further increase its prominence, and thus its harm, in the street-scene. The use of matching materials would not overcome the harm I have identified.

7. The garage that is proposed to be demolished to make way for the extension is set lower than the dwelling and the proposed extension. It is of low-scale and does not have a directly comparable impact, or cause the harm, that I have identified would be caused by the proposed development. Therefore, its presence and removal does not justify the harm I have identified.
8. I acknowledge that there is a notable gap to the side of the property, unlike other properties in the street. The gap serves to provide a pleasant spacious feel to the immediate area and its existence does not offer an assumption that it should be developed in the manner proposed.
9. The appellant has referred to other extensions to properties in the street. I observed these on my site visit. Although I do not have full details of these examples, it is clear to me that they are quite different in size and siting from the appeal proposal. They therefore have limited weight in the appeal which I have, in any event, determined on its own individual planning merits.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Replacement Calderdale Unitary Development Plan (2006) which requires, amongst other things, that development should respect and enhance the established character and appearance of existing buildings and the surroundings in terms of layout, scale, massing, siting and design.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR