



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2024

by N Kempton BAHons PGDip MA IHBC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/D/23/3328788

Revista, Kensington Road, Savile Park, Halifax HX3 0JA

- 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 Kafait Hussain against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00316/HSE, dated 20 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side and rear extension with minor alterations to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the determination of this application, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I consider that there is no requirement for me to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by this.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the Savile Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is situated within the Savile Park Conservation Area (CA). The statutory duty set out in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (the Act) 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
5. Part of the CA's significance is its range of buildings, which demonstrate the historical development of social and healthcare provision, both public and private, in the latter half of the C19/ early C20, together with a range of domestic properties, which demonstrate the development of domestic buildings across the strata of society and over time.
6. It has architectural significance too from its variety and arrangement of housing types ranging from large villa properties to small back-to-back terraces, with a higher concentration of large villa properties in extensive

grounds in the Savile Park area compared with other parts of Halifax. There are large stone properties, both detached and semi-detached, set in garden plots behind stone boundary walls, high to the rear, with gates and overhanging vegetation. Some properties have individual drives, but many have pedestrian access only to their primary frontage. Terraces of smaller properties tend to have small front gardens with stone boundary walls and pedestrian gates. Residential properties exhibit consistency in height and massing- generally two storeys, some with attics, more often than not characterised by an uninterrupted roofscape with high chimneys. All of these townscape and spatial features contribute to the significance of the CA, which shows little evidence of insensitive additions and alterations to its houses.

7. As is characteristic of the wider CA, this part of Kensington Road is characterised by low density residential development. Properties are predominantly stone built, two-storey, detached dwellings, diverse in style, set in spacious plots with generous mature gardens behind stone boundary walls with gates and private drives.
8. Savile Park is significant locally, being the only large area of unenclosed public green space within the built-up area- as distinct from the formal Victorian public parks in other parts of Halifax. Mature trees play an important part in defining the character of the CA and views often have a backdrop of trees- both street and garden trees, including the street trees on Kensington Road.
9. The two-storey gable on the front elevation, as proposed, would significantly alter the appearance of the dwelling, which is visible from the public realm. The gable would be visually prominent and intrusive by reason of its scale, massing and design detailing. The disproportionately wide gable results in a shallow roof pitch. The width of the gable is accentuated by the wide bands of glazing, giving an unduly horizontal emphasis. The glazed panels, which extend from ground floor through to the apex, increase the perceived height of the extension and emphasise the overall scale of this upward extension.
10. The extension, at a full two-storeys, is substantially larger than that of the existing double garage, and the bulk and massing of the extension is not relieved by any articulation. The proposed development would dominate the host property, appearing as an incongruous and discordant feature, as viewed from Kensington Road and notwithstanding the diverse and extended properties in the vicinity.
11. The CA is characterised by a predominance of stone, though I observed the use of render in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. Notwithstanding this, the proposed development would be conspicuous by reasons of the disproportionate scale and massing, which would be further accentuated by the proposed use of render. As such, the proposed material palette would compound the harm identified above.
12. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve the appearance of the CA, to the desirability of the preservation or enhancement of which I am required to pay special attention. Instead, it would undermine the significance of the CA.
13. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) describes heritage assets as an irreplaceable resource, that should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations. Paragraph

205 of the Framework advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. It goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets.

14. I find the harm to the CA to be less than substantial, but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 208 of the Framework establishes that any harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
15. The proposal would increase the habitable accommodation of the dwelling. However, this would be a private benefit; it would not benefit the public at large. There would be some economic benefits arising from the construction process. However, given the scale of the proposal, this benefit attracts limited weight. It would not outweigh the harm to the significance of the CA, to the conservation of which the Framework requires great weight be given and should require clear and convincing justification.
16. The proposed development would not accord with policy BT1 of the Calderdale Local Plan 2023 as it would fail to respect or enhance the character and appearance of existing buildings and surroundings, taking account of its local context and distinctiveness, in particular any heritage assets. The proposal would not constitute high quality design. Furthermore, the proposal would not accord with policy HE1 of the Calderdale Local Plan 2023, which establishes that development proposals should conserve, and where appropriate, enhance the historic environment. This policy states that development proposals will be expected to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Other Matters

17. I note the appellant's references to neighbouring properties. While I have not been provided with the full circumstances which led to these developments, which limits the parallels I can draw. I acknowledge that they are within the CA and have been altered and extended. They have a bearing on the appearance of the CA. However, because of their designs, which are different to the approach in this case, they do not undermine the significance of the CA as does this proposal.

Conclusion

18. I conclude therefore that the proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and section 16 of the Framework. It would not be in accordance with the development plan, when read as a whole and there are no other considerations that outweigh this conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

N Kempton

INSPECTOR