



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2025

by R Gravett BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/D/24/3357676

The Hame, Green Gables, Stainland Road, Sowood, Elland, Calderdale HX4 9HT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr P Bull against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00895/HSE.
 - The development proposed is bay window extension to front elevation with balcony over.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed bay window extension to front elevation with balcony over at The Hame, Green Gables, Stainland Road, Sowood, Elland, Calderdale HX4 9HT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00895/HSE, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: Location Plan (24-522/00); Proposed Site Plan (24-522/P101); Proposed Plans (24-522/100); and Proposed Elevations (24:522/P300).
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, Green Gables, is a two-storey detached dwelling constructed in stone, partly rendered and has a pitched roof with low eaves. To one side of the front elevation, is a gable with a shallow bay window at both ground and first floor. It is proposed to replace this bay with a deeper, square bay window at ground floor, with a balcony above to be accessed from a first-floor bedroom.
4. The appeal property forms part of a row of eight dwellings on the north-east side of Stainland Road which are all set back from the road behind front gardens and driveways on a similar building line. Although of a stone construction, and possibly built around the same time, the form, design and detailing of dwellings in the row varies. The three pairs of semi-detached hipped roof dwellings either have a ground floor bay located centrally within the front elevation, or a two storey bay

window located to one side. These semis are flanked on one side by a detached bungalow and on the other side by the detached appeal property. Both are of markedly differing appearance to the semis.

5. The guidance at paragraph 2.5.1 of the *Calderdale Placemaking and Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2024)* (SPD) is that the building line and set back are fundamental to the appearance of the street and should be consistent with the character of the area. At paragraph 2.10.2, the SPD further advises that extensions should not extend beyond the established front building line, but an exception may be made for residential properties where small extensions, such as bay windows, would enhance the character of the existing building.
6. Green Gables has recently been extended to both sides and the rear, and a small porch has been added which projects forwards from the original front elevation. The proposed ground floor bay window would extend past this porch extension by a minimal amount. Nevertheless, I observed that the row of dwellings are well spaced. There is a notable break in the built form between two of the pairs of semi-detached dwellings, where there is vehicle access to the fields behind. In consequence, and that this dwelling is at the end of the row, the building line is not so strong or legible that it is fundamental to the appearance of the street, or a strongly defining characteristic of this part of the row.
7. That the appeal site is detached, has differing forms, the side extensions being predominantly finished in a render with contemporary fenestration and detailing, means it already is viewed as markedly different from its more traditional stone constructed neighbours. I acknowledge that by projecting slightly forward of it, the proposed bay window with balcony above would have some degree of prominence on the front elevation.
8. However, my judgement is that it would be a pleasing focal point to the front elevation of its host, enhancing its already contemporary character, whilst retaining some limited synergy with the broad pattern of bay windows in the surrounding area. It would not make the host building unduly conspicuous. Therefore, I find the appeal proposal to be a modest extension which, despite extending beyond the front building line, in this specific instance, would respect and enhance the character of its host, providing a strong reason for a minor departure from the alignment. Consequently, it would be consistent with the SPD guidance above.
9. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with Policy BT1 of the Calderdale Local Plan 2018/19 – 2032/33 (2023) (LP) in so far as it requires new development to be of high quality design which respects or enhances the character and appearance of existing buildings and surroundings.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time condition for implementation, I have imposed a condition to ensure that the development is built in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In the interests of high quality design, it is also necessary to impose a condition requiring that the external materials of the extension match those of the host dwelling.

11. The Delegated Report refers to a condition requiring a 'species enhancement statement' to be submitted to ensure that the proposal complies with LP Policy GN3. This policy requires, amongst other things, development to conserve and enhance biodiversity by protecting and improving habitats. Despite this reference, the Council has not subsequently advanced a condition for my consideration. Moreover, there is no suggestion the appeal scheme, a small alteration to a recently renovated dwelling, would result in any perceptible effect upon, harm to, or not conserve biodiversity consistent with the policy objectives. Therefore, based on the evidence advanced, any such condition would not be necessary to make the development acceptable.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, the proposal accords with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations do not indicate a decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude the appeal should be allowed.

R Gravett

INSPECTOR