



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2025 by Sara Manson DipTP

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/D/25/3370373

51 Dyson Road, Halifax HX1 4RJ

- 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 I Hussain against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00287/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as “front and rear dormers and front window.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

3. The Council do not object to the rear dormer window and first floor front window elements of the scheme, and I have no reason to disagree. My recommendation therefore focusses on the front dormer window and, specifically, its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is a two-storey, mid-terraced dwelling on a residential street with development confined to one side. The street is mainly composed of blocks of six units. The properties share a consistent architectural style, characterised by regular widths, aligned fenestration, and coordinated entrance detailing, often including a small first-floor window above the front door. Each dwelling is set back from the highway behind a small walled front garden. These elements lead to a strong uniformed, cohesive quality to the street scene that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. Several terraced blocks, including the one containing the appeal site, retain a plain, simple, and unbroken roofscape. Further along the street, some dwellings have incorporated front dormer windows of varying size, design, and age. The proposed dormer window, although set up from the eaves and down from the ridge would occupy over half the width of the existing roof and be misaligned with the windows below.

6. This would result in an overly large dominant addition that would significantly alter the roof's original form and massing, undermining the simplicity and architectural rhythm of the terrace. The increased bulk and visual prominence would lead to a top-heavy appearance and incongruous addition that would disrupt the characteristics of this section of Dyson Road where roof slopes remain largely intact and unaltered. I appreciate the proposal would be finished in appropriate materials however this element would not sufficiently reduce the harm caused by the proposal's bulk and prominence.
7. Although a small number of front dormer windows are visible within the street scene, they are limited in number and do not reflect the prevailing character of the area. Most were constructed prior to the adoption of current local plan policies and are concentrated predominantly at one end of the street. The only recent exception, Number 73 Dyson Road, incorporates a modestly scaled dormer window that aligns more appropriately with the fenestration below. These few and largely historic additions do not establish a precedent that would support allowing the appeal.
8. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policy BT1 of the Calderdale Local Plan 2018/19 – 2032/33 Written Statement (2023) and guidance set out in the Calderdale Placemaking and Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2024) which, amongst other things, aim for new development to respect or enhance the character and appearance of existing buildings and surroundings, taking account of local context and distinctiveness.

Other Matter

9. The resolution of any concerns over the Council's handling of the planning application and specifically how it was decided rest with the main parties to resolve and has no bearing on my consideration of the main issue for this appeal or for the appeal at the neighbouring property. The proposed development has been considered on its own merits with regard to the specifics of its context.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposals would conflict with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sara Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR