



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2022

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24TH May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/D/22/3296013

29 Godley Gardens, Shibden Estate, Halifax, HX3 6XH

- 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 Murphy against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00346/HSE, dated 8 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is Proposed two storey extension to the side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling consisting of six two storey houses angled towards the road. The terrace follows the same characteristics as the other rows of six terraced houses and are very ordered in their arrangement with a uniform appearance. It is seen in the context of these similar terraces and specifically relates to them.
4. An extension as proposed would not appear subordinate to the host dwelling even with a setback incorporated into the design, due to its large scale and massing. Its wide proportions when compared to the width of the host dwelling would appear as a bulky and incongruous addition to it. The prominent location would further emphasise its appearance and would not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the local area.
5. There are extensions visible to other properties seen within close range of the appeal site. However, some are to semi-detached houses which is a different style of dwelling. The scale and proportions of the other extensions and their context are not the same as the appeal site. None of these examples share the same characteristics as the appeal proposal before me and therefore I am not convinced can reasonably be compared.
6. I appreciate the appellant has made efforts to reduce its size and improve the detailing to the proposed extension and this is noted. I also understand their desire to increase the size of the dwelling due to their family needs. However, the disproportionately large addition that would be adversely harmful to the

character and appearance of the local area would not outweigh these considerations.

7. Therefore, to conclude, the proposed extension would not appear as a subordinate addition and would detrimentally harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the local area. It would thus conflict with the design aims of Policy BE1 of the Replacement Calderdale Unitary Development Plan 2006.

Conclusion

8. Given the harmful effect of the proposed development by virtue of its scale and massing on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area, it would lead to 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.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR

