



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2025

by K Winnard LLB Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/D/25/3365379
164 Green Park Road, Halifax HX3 0SP

- 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 Mrs Jabine Sadiq against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00013/HSE.
 - The development proposed are front, side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Although intended to be an access required site visit, the site visit was undertaken on an unaccompanied basis and there was the opportunity to view the site of the proposed development from the highway.
3. The development, the subject of the appeal, consists of a number of elements. The Council has indicated that it has no objections to the single storey front porch and its concerns relate to the rear and side extensions. I shall accordingly direct my assessment to these elements of the proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property, No 164 Green Park Road (No 164), lies 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. No full conservation area analysis is before me, but from the information before me and my observations on my site visit, this part of the SGCA is characterised by semi-detached properties with front and rear gardens of a similar style and design, with hipped roofs and bay windows on the front elevations of either render or

rosemary tiles. Whilst some of the dwellings have been extended and altered, there is a generally cohesive character of two storey, red brick development.

7. The proposal would consist of a number of extensions at the front, side and rear at ground, first and roof level of the property with a variety of roof styles. The Council's Placemaking and Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides that an extension that doubles the size of the original building or is twice the width of it is very unlikely to be acceptable. The proposed side extension would be a full two stories in height level with the existing roofline and would occupy a substantial part of the side garden between the dwelling and the boundary fence. It would be a sizeable addition and would result in a large dwelling, almost doubling its size. There would be no features designed to achieve subservience and notwithstanding the size of the side garden, the extension would appear unduly prominent and disproportionate to the size of the host dwelling. I acknowledge that due to the orientation with the neighbouring dwellings, no terracing effect between the properties would be created. However, this in itself would not mitigate against the harm I have identified.
8. The scale and design of the rear alterations would be sizeable resulting in differing roof forms which together would form an incongruous addition to the host dwelling. The scale of the alterations and variety in roof forms would not be compatible with the simple design of the original dwelling. I appreciate that the bulk of these alterations would not be visible from Green Park Road, however they would be seen in private views from gardens across this part of the SGCA. Whilst these may not be public views, they nonetheless form part of the surroundings in which the heritage asset is experienced. Hence overall, the development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to neighbouring and other dwellings which have been the subject of large side extensions. Whilst I observed these properties on my site visit, I am not aware of the full circumstances surrounding any of these developments. However, such extended dwellings are not prevalent within the streetscene where the original appearance of housing and the rhythm of the street remains largely intact. Further, they were in the main sited on corner plots at a lower level to Green Park Road. As such they are less prominent within the streetscene and do not represent a direct parallel with the appeal proposal. In any event, the existence of these developments does not justify development which would otherwise be unacceptable.
10. The appellant refers to a number of appeal decisions. Different conclusions were reached on what is a matter of judgment dependent on the bespoke site and specific context of each case and its area. Each case must be decided on its own merits and such decisions are not directly comparable to the scheme before me, and do not alter my view.
11. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and consequently the character and appearance of the SGCA. However, in the context of the SGCA as a whole the proposal would be relatively localised and as such would cause less than substantial harm to the SGCA as a designated asset. Nonetheless this is a matter to which I give considerable weight. Under such circumstances the Framework advised that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme.

12. The proposal would provide additional living space for the occupiers of the property and result in a larger property. This would have a beneficial effect on the overall housing stock enabling families to live within the local area. The proposal would also provide short term employment and associated economic benefits. Whilst these would be public benefits, they would be modest and insufficient to outweigh the totality of the harm to the SGCA I have found. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to comply with national policy.
13. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character of the SGCA. It would also cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of No 164, and the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies BT1 and HE1 of the Calderdale Local Plan 2018/19 -2032/33 (adopted March 2023) 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. It would also conflict with the SPD in relation to the design of extensions.
14. For the reasons given and having regard to all matters raised I hereby dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR