



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: 16 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/D/25/3370366

53 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 Miss M Ali against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00269/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as “front and rear dormer (rear dormer under PD).”
-

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 element 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 property is a mid-terraced, two-storey dwelling situated on a residential street with development confined to one side. The terraces are generally arranged in uniform blocks of six, characterised by consistent building widths, aligned fenestration, and similar entrance detailing. Properties are set back behind small walled front gardens, contributing to a coherent and attractive streetscape. Several blocks, including the one containing the appeal site, retain a simple and unaltered roofscape, leading to a strong uniformed, cohesive quality to the street scene that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. While some dwellings further along the street have added front dormer windows, these vary in form and appearance and are not typical of the prevailing roof profile. Although the proposal would be set up from the eaves and down from the ridge, it would occupy more than half the width of the roof and introduce window proportions that would not align with those below. Its design and scale would significantly alter the roof's original form and massing, undermining the simplicity and original 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 does not sufficiently reduce the harm that would be caused by the proposal's bulk and prominence.

6. A small number of front dormer windows are visible within the street scene. Most were constructed prior to the adoption of current local plan policies and are predominantly concentrated 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 such a precedent that would support allowing the appeal.
7. Therefore, the proposal would have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the area. As such it would fail to comply 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 both aim, amongst other things, 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

8. Any concerns over the decision making process for the planning application are matters between the main parties 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

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal 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

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR