



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2025

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/D/25/3368689**

**10 Perseverance Road, Bradshaw, Halifax BD13 1LY**

- 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 Sam Abel against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application reference is 25/00254/HSE.
  - The development proposed is an additional floor on existing extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are whether the proposal would amount to inappropriate development within the Green Belt; whether there would be any other harm to the Green Belt; and whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

### Reasons

3. The above description is taken from the application form. The proposal would result in a first floor extension over an existing ground floor lean-to extension. Although of a satisfactory design, as a continuation of the form of the two-storey element of the property, it would result in a building of greater overall scale, even when taking into account the size of the conservatory that would be removed.

#### *Whether inappropriate development within the Green Belt*

4. The council advises that the original property has already been extended by the addition of front, side and rear single storey extensions. Not including the conservatory, these have resulted in an increase in volume of the original building of 52%. Although the proposal would not increase the footprint of development, it would result in a further increase in scale. For the purposes of Green Belt policy, for a building of this age, the original building must be considered as the building as it existed on 1 July 1948. On the basis of the council's calculations and the evidence of the additions to the property, the proposed increase in size, when considered in association with the other existing extensions, would represent disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

5. Whilst the appellant has referred to the design, the materials and the improvements that would result to the accommodation; and to other developments that have been permitted in the area, no reference has been made to what constitutes the original building and no comparison has been made with regard to the overall change in scale since 1948. The only calculation provided relates to a comparison between the existing floor space of the conservatory and that of the proposed extension, advising that the difference represents only an increase of 8 square metres of additional floor space. There is nothing in the appellant's case that suggests that the council is incorrect with regard to what constitutes the original building; or whether the property already has extensions that have resulted in an increase in volume of 52%, excluding the conservatory. There is nothing therefore to suggest that the cumulative increase in scale of the building, compared to its size in 1948, would not represent disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
6. The above assessment is fundamental to policy GB1 of the Calderdale Local Plan 2023. It advises that within the Green Belt, the construction of new buildings is inappropriate development except if it satisfies one of a number of circumstances. Part I(c) accepts the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. It must be concluded therefore that the proposal, in combination with existing extensions, represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

#### *Any other harm*

7. The increase in volume of development does result in a very limited reduction in openness, despite the removal of the conservatory.

#### *Other considerations*

8. As the proposal builds upon an existing extension and does not extend beyond the current building footprint, within an area of other properties, the amount of harm to openness is very limited.
9. The proposal results in a modest and relatively subservient addition which maintains the dwelling's proportions and character. It would result in the removal of the conservatory which would improve the overall appearance of the property so contributing positively to the character and appearance of the area. The design detail and materials would be appropriate in this context and the refurbishments would result in positive economic considerations together with the positive social considerations that would result from the improvements to the property.
10. The examples of other developments in the locality are not supported with evidence in relation to whether each represented inappropriate development or not. In the absence of such information, these do not offer support for the details currently proposed. This is particularly the case as the council has not raised concerns with regard to the detail of the proposed works, only that the works represent inappropriate development and result in some loss of openness.

#### *Conclusions*

11. Overall, there would be a minor benefit to the character and appearance of the area from the removal of the conservatory. The works would improve the functionality of the property and result in local economic activity. However, the proposal would

represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would result in a minor reduction in openness. Part III of policy GB1 advises that inappropriate development will not be supported except in very special circumstances to be demonstrated by the applicant. This reflects the Green Belt policy of the National Planning Policy Framework which is clear that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. Harm to the Green Belt includes from inappropriateness and any reduction in openness.

12. The considerations put forward would not clearly outweigh the harm from inappropriateness and the reduction in openness. They do not therefore represent the very special circumstances that are necessary to justify the development. It would therefore conflict with policy GB1 and the specific policies of the Framework, relating to the Green Belt, that indicate that the development should not be approved. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

*Peter Eggleton*

INSPECTOR