



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2023

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/23/3322528

8 St Ives Road Skircoat Green Halifax HX3 0LT

- 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 Ellie O'Halloran against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01336/HSE, dated 7 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is a dormer window to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council amended the description of the development and I note that the appellant's agent has also utilised this description on the appeal form. I have used the Council's description as this provides a more accurate description of the development.
3. I note that a revised plan was submitted to the Council which reduced the size of the dormer. My decision is based on the revised plan.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, having regard to its conservation area status.

Reasons

5. The appeal property, 8 St Ives Road (No 8), is located within the Skircoat Green Conservation Area (SGCA) where there is a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of the area. In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that great weight should be attached to the conservation of designated heritage assets, in this case the SGCA.
6. The SGCA analysis is not before me but I note that St Ives Road is described as characterised by primarily terraced properties with stone front boundary walls. Whilst No 8 is one of a pair of semi detached properties distinguishable, by its design and materials, from the majority of properties on St Ives Road, it

nonetheless shares the same overall regular pattern of simple rear roof slopes and central spaced chimney stacks with other dwellings in the immediate area. On my site visit I noted that there did not appear to be any dormer windows to rear roof slopes in the immediate vicinity of No 8 and there was a sense of coherence in these rear roof slopes which gives an attractive uniformity to the area.

7. Whilst set down from the ridge and constructed in similar materials, the flat roof design of the dormer would project out from the roof slope and would result in a "boxy" appearance which would interrupt the uniformity of rear roof profiles along the street. It would be an unsympathetic and pronounced feature that would be out of keeping with the appearance of the roof profiles along the rear of the properties in this area. As such, I consider that the proposal would result in an incongruous addition which would harm the appearance of the host dwelling, the group of dwellings in which it is located and the area. Whilst I appreciate that the dormer is at the rear of the property it would be readily visible from St Ives Gardens, and also in views from gardens across this part of the SGCA. Whilst the latter may not be public views they nonetheless form part of the surroundings in which the heritage asset is experienced.
8. I appreciate that No 4 St Ives Road has the benefit of a dormer to the front elevation. However I do not have any details in which this extension with the alteration to the front roofscape was accepted and so cannot make direct comparisons with the appeal property. Nor, given that it is at the front of the dwelling, does it impact on the views and coherence of the roof slopes found at the rear of these dwellings. I acknowledge too that dormers are a common feature particularly on Skircoat Green Road to the east of No 8. However, I have not been provided with full details of these cases and am unaware of their specific circumstances. Despite the presence of these other dormer roof alterations, I have determined the appeal scheme on its own merits and as identified above, I have found harm in relation to the main issue.
9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would neither preserve or enhance the SGCA. Given the size and scale of the proposal within the SGCA as a whole, the harm that would arise would be localised and the impact on the SGCA would be less than substantial within the meaning of the Framework. Under such circumstances paragraph 202 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal would provide additional living space and improvements to the quality of the accommodation within the house. This would have a beneficial effect on the overall housing stock. Whilst this would be a public benefit it would be modest and insufficient to outweigh the harm I have found. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to comply with national policy.
10. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the SGCA. It would also cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of No 8, and the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies BT1 and HE1 of the Calderdale Local Plan which requires development to respect and enhance the character and appearance of its surroundings taking account of the local context, and in particular any heritage assets.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given and having regard to all matters raised, I hereby dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR