



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 21 September 2021

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/D/21/3272417

15 Newbury Road, Brighouse HD6 3PG

- 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 Smith against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01434/HSE, dated 25 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a two storey extension to front of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. A revised National Planning Policy Framework was published in July 2021 (the Framework). Whilst the paragraph numbers have changed in regard to those relevant to the main issue of this case, the substance thereof remains the same as the 2019 iteration. I have not therefore sought the views of the main parties. I have proceeded with reference to the 2021 Framework in my findings.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling situated on a cul-de-sac which contains regular spaced properties that are separated from each other by driveways and garden areas. Different groups of properties around the cul-de-sac have regular front building lines, and the steeply sloping topography results in properties being set at varying levels from the road. The layout and topography provide views over and between dwellings, which alongside trees and planting in garden areas, contributes to a spacious and verdant character.
5. The proposal would project around 4.85m from the front elevation over two storeys. It would stand forward of the consistent building line along this section of Newbury Road and given this positioning and its scale, it would have an overly dominant impact on the host property. This dominance would be emphasised by the large blank wall on the south-eastern elevation which would appear as a prominent feature.

6. I note the appeal property is in a corner location and Newbury Road turns broadly to the south-east before reaching the property. However, I do not consider that this makes the property less noticeable. It is elevated from the road and clearly seen from various public vantage points, including from lower parts of Newbury Road. I note the submission of computer generated images, but these illustrate the open area to the front of the appeal building which would make the development conspicuous. Rather than supporting the acceptability of the proposal, they demonstrate the harm that would arise from the extension, which would dominate the host property and adversely impact the character and appearance of the area.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. As such, and whilst noting that the Council does not have any specific design guidance on house extensions to adhere to, the development would conflict with Policy BE 1 of the Replacement Calderdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP), which seeks, amongst other matters, for development to respect and enhance the established character and appearance of existing buildings and the surroundings. My attention has also been drawn to Policy H2 of the UDP, which seeks to ensure, amongst other matters, that the quality of a housing area is not harmed. The proposal would be contrary to this policy and to Paragraph 130 of the Framework, which seeks, amongst other matters, development that is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR