



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2025

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/D/25/3369230

35 Springwood Avenue, Copley, Halifax HX3 0UT

- 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 John Frank against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00061/HSE.
 - The development proposed is a hipped roof replaced with gabled pitch roof, dormer roof extension and solar panels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling with a hipped roof that has a 2-storey elevation facing Springwood Avenue. It stands within a row of similar dwellings that occupy a lower position relative to the road due to the notable difference in ground levels. As a result, the main roof of No 35 facing the road and those on either side of the site are prominent features in the local street scene. When seen from the highway, the broadly consistent style, use of materials and hipped roof form of this group is a notable feature of the streetscape. It establishes a rhythm to existing development along this part of Springwood Avenue.
4. I saw an eclectic mix of buildings in the local area, with some that include gable ends and dormers that are visible from the road. The appellant has referred and provided photographs of such properties, which I saw at the site visit. I agree that existing built form in the local area is varied. Even so, it is within the row of similar dwellings along the same side of Springwood Avenue that No 35 is primarily seen.
5. The proposal is to enlarge No 35 by raising the height and extending the main roof to form a gable at each end. A new dormer would be placed onto the extended front roof slope with solar panels installed at the rear. The new dormer would be set in from all 4 sides of the host roof. Nevertheless, it would extend across almost the full width of the main house and so it would be a sizeable addition.
6. The additional built form, increased height and gable ends of the completed building would significantly add to the scale and bulk of No 35 at roof level. The

appeal scheme would set the finished building clearly apart from the properties in the same group and cause it to gain prominence in the local street scene. When seen from the road, the visual impact of the proposal would be accentuated by the lower-level position of the dwelling relative to the highway and the discordant relationship with the existing dwellings on either side. By unduly disrupting the pattern of existing development along this section of Springwood Avenue, the proposal would be obtrusive in the street scene and an unwelcome addition to the local area.

7. According to the Officer's report, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Placemaking and Design Guide* (SPD) notes that raising roof heights and changes to the form of the roof slope must not project above the ridge of the dwelling or, in the case of a hipped roof, beyond the slope. It also states that dormers should not detract from the character of the building or the local area. For the reasons given, the proposal would not comply with this guidance.
8. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area. As such, it conflicts with Policies BT1 and GN4 of the Calderdale Local Plan 2018/19 - 2032/33 and the Council's SPD. Together, these policies and guidance aim to ensure that development achieves a high standard of design and respects or enhances local character. It is also at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which states that development should be sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of the area.
9. I acknowledge that upward extensions can come forward on certain properties through the exercise of permitted development (PD) rights. It may be that a full additional storey would exceed the height increase proposed. Nevertheless, planning permission is sought for the proposal and I have assessed it on that basis.
10. The site is not within a conservation area. The proposed extension would make efficient use of the space available at roof level. It would address damp problems with the existing roof and so prevent water ingress that would otherwise cause the condition of the building to deteriorate. The use of renewable energy is supported in policy terms and the installation of solar panels would take advantage of the south facing rear roof slope. Others raise no objection. The Council raises no concern on other issues such as flood risk, residential amenity and highway safety. I have no reason to reach a different view on these matters. However, these considerations do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

11. Overall, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan, when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
12. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR