



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2025

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/D/25/3363933

61 Kershaw Crescent, Luddenfoot, Halifax, HX2 6NR

- 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 Mark Bowmer against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01282/HSE.
 - The development proposed is a side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the appearance of both the existing dwelling and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling, which is situated within a residential estate. The property sits on the corner of Kershaw Crescent and Greave House Park. It has a wide side garden, which is enclosed by a low wall with timber fencing above. The dwelling occupies a relatively prominent position in the streetscene.
4. The existing dwelling has a rather plain and simple appearance, which is a main characteristic of other properties along Kershaw Crescent and Greaves House Park. This characteristic gives a high degree of uniformity to the streetscene.
5. The proposal is to construct a side extension with front and rear facing dormers in the roof space. The extension would provide a double garage, laundry, and shower room on the ground floor with a bedroom above. At its closest point, the front corner of the extension would be 1.3m from the side boundary, but the distance would be considerably greater at the rear due to boundary running at an angle away from the building.
6. The Council contends that the proposal would be an overly dominant and incongruous addition that would detract from the appearance of the host dwelling and the character of the area. The Council states that the proposal would conflict with Policies BT1 and GN4 of the Calderdale Local Plan (LP) and against the advice and principles contained in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Placemaking and Design Guide (SPD). It also refers to a conflict with Section 12 of The National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (The Framework).

7. Policy BT1 of the LP seeks to ensure that the design of new development is of a high standard and makes a positive contribution to the area. This accords with Paragraph 135 of The Framework. Policy GN4 concerns the impact of development on its landscape setting. However, given the location of the site within a residential estate, I am not persuaded that Policy GN4 is wholly relevant to the appeal proposal. In reaching my decision, I have also attributed weight to the provisions of the Council's SPD in relation to the size of extensions and the design and position of dormer structures.
8. I have considered the appellant's arguments regarding the merits of the design and appearance of the existing dwelling and the fact that the roof height of the extension would be lower than the height of the roof of the existing dwelling. I have also noted that no objections have been raised by third parties and I accept that the proposal would enhance the living conditions of the occupants.
9. However, I do not accept the argument that the corner plot location allows for a greater flexibility of design. The corner plot position means that the extension would be more prominent and would impact on the streetscene.
10. The proposed extension would be both longer and wider than the existing dwelling and it would appear overly dominant, out of scale and at odds with the character and appearance of the existing property. The relatively large dormers would also add to the bulk of the extension and introduce a feature that would appear alien and unduly prominent in the streetscene. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would conflict with the LP and with The Framework, as referred to above. Furthermore, this conflict is not outweighed by other material considerations.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR