



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17TH March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/D/21/3289700

61 Green Park Road, Halifax HX3 0SN

- 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 Mrs Gvozdenko against the decision of the Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01472/HSE, dated 01 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as side dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The site is within a predominantly residential area within the Skircoat Green Conservation Area. In accordance with the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; I am required to have special regard to the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the area.
4. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposal on such an asset. This is irrespective of the level of harm.
5. Neither party have provided any substantive details relating to the significance of the conservation area however during my site visit I noted that the area was characterised by predominantly two-storey, hipped roof, red bricked properties, some with partial rendering. Many properties in the surrounding area have been extended and altered.
6. The site is located within a residential estate where many of the properties share similar features and materials. The proposal would introduce a prominent form of development in the immediate area which despite the use of sympathetic materials, would be dominant and incongruous in the streetscene.

7. The proposed development would be an unsympathetic addition to the host property and immediate area. I find that the proposed development would diminish unacceptably the character and appearance of the area in general and would be out of keeping with the host property.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area and the host property. There would be conflict with Policies BE1 and BE18 of the Replacement Calderdale Unitary Development Plan (2006, as amended 2009) which amongst other things seeks to preserve or enhance the conservation areas and ensuring developments respect building form and local identity.
9. My attention has been drawn by the appellant to similar developments within close proximity to the appeal site. Substantive details have not been provided to allow me to assess these schemes against the proposal before me. Notwithstanding this I did observe a small number of side dormers on properties near the appeal site. These are not a common feature and did not persuade me that this form of development preserved or enhanced the area. In any event each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR