



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 May 2025

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/D/25/3363545

111 Healey Wood Road, Brighouse, Huddersfield HD6 3RR

- 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 James Kinnear against the decision of Calderdale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01206/HSE
 - The development proposed are the erection of a first floor extension and canopy to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 111 Healey Wood Road, (No 111) is a semi-detached dwelling located on a steeply inclined residential street. This side of the street has a generally consistent character of semi detached dwellings of a similar design and style set back from the road behind front gardens. The topography of the road, as it rises and curves upwards, gives a natural staggering of roof heights.
4. The Council's Placemaking and Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted in 2023, provides that extensions should be proportionate to the size and form of the original building and in particular those visible from the street should generally be set back from the front of the house and lower than the existing roof line. This would not be the case in this instance. By extending beyond the front of the building the first floor gable roof extension would add considerable bulk to No 111 and would be unduly prominent within the streetscene. In combination with the same level ridge as the existing dwelling, the extension would not be subservient to the original dwelling and would be a dominant feature within the streetscene particularly in views when approaching upwards along Healey Wood Road in a southerly direction. As such it would be at odds with the scale and pattern of the dwellings found on this part of the street and would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The appellant refers me to a number of extensions to properties on the street with similar extensions. Whilst I observed these properties on my site visit, I am not

aware of the full circumstances surrounding any of these developments or when these works were undertaken. However such extensions are not prevalent within the area where the original appearance of housing remains largely intact. Even if front projections elsewhere benefit from planning permission or were considered in the same policy context they do not provide a justification for the proposal. As such these developments only merit limited weight and do not lead me to a different view in this case.

6. I note that the proposal is acceptable in relation to highway issues and that no concerns have been raised by the Council in relation to the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties or other matters. Further in reaching my decision I have had regard to references within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), including the incorporation of energy and water efficiency measures and the sustainability of the proposal. Whilst I have given moderate weight to the provisions cited in support they do not outweigh the harm I have identified above in respect of the proposal. The appellant also highlights that the proposal would also be constructed in matching materials however aspects of good design are fundamental to all development and would not represent a notable benefit .
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such it is contrary to Policy BT1 of the Calderdale Local Plan 2018/19-2032/33 (adopted March 2023) which requires new development to respect or enhance the character and appearance of its surroundings, including reference to height, massing, scale and form. It would conflict with guidance contained within the SPD in relation to the design and subservience of front extensions generally. It would also conflict with the Framework which requires development to be sympathetic to local character.
8. Accordingly, for the reasons given, I hereby dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR