



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2019

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/19/3233306

9 Denton Road, Ilkley LS29 0AA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Winterbottom against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01183/HOU, dated 15 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable, ground and first floor rear extension, front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has requested that revised plans which would amend the rear gable extension, and remove the hip to gable extension, and the front dormer, be taken into account in the appeal process. Although the revised plans had been submitted to the Council, it did not accept them. They are not therefore the plans that were considered by the Council and upon which interested people's views were sought. While the Council has indicated that it could not support the proposed revised scheme, I have insufficient evidence to demonstrate that either of the revised plans has been fully considered by the Council. On that basis, if I was to accept them, I cannot be certain that any party, including objectors, would not be prejudiced by my so doing. Therefore, I have not taken the revised plans into account and I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans that were determined by the Council.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the Middleton Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. No 9 is a single storey semi-detached property between Denton Road and the River Wharfe, at the southern edge of the Middleton Conservation Area (the CA). The CA extends northwards from the river and includes large areas of open land along the river together with the predominantly residential areas that are bordered by woodlands to the north. The significance of the CA is derived in part from the large houses, widely spaced and set in generous mature plots. Properties are varied in style and age, and include early 20th

century Arts and Crafts houses constructed in render and Ilkley Gritstone with red clay tile roofs.

5. Although No 9 and the adjoining dwelling are not key unlisted buildings in the CA, they are examples of the Arts and Crafts style with their distinctive tall chimneys and characteristic roofscape. According to the Middleton Conservation Area Appraisal Adopted February 2009 (the MCAA), the group of properties of which No 9 forms part make a neutral contribution to the character of the CA.
6. The proposed gable end would result in the loss of the hipped roof form and chimney stack which are characteristic features of this pair of semi-detached properties. It would unbalance the symmetry of the roofscape and it would not respect the distinctive character of No 9 and the neighbouring property. The MCAA identifies that the gradual loss of traditional features and details is a threat to the CA. Consequently, the gable end would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property, the street scene and the wider townscape.
7. The proposed dormers to both the front and rear of the property would be conspicuously large and bulky features, contrary to the guidance in the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document Adopted April 2012. They would be out of scale with, and they would not relate well to, the modest dormers of the adjoining property. When viewed from the street, the front dormer would be a prominent and discordant feature that would disrupt the harmonious appearance of the traditional roofscape.
8. The first floor rear extension would be a substantial and bulky addition that would be visible from the adjacent open green space and from the river path immediately to the rear of the properties. By virtue of its height and size, it would not appear subservient to the host property. Furthermore, in combination with the balcony, the gable end, the single storey extension and the enlarged dormer, it would overwhelm the rear of the appeal property. As a result of the extensive additions and alterations, the rear elevation would be noticeably dissimilar and out of scale with the adjoining property. It would not be sympathetic to its surroundings and it would not reinforce local distinctiveness or contribute positively to place-making.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Middleton CA. However, it would be relatively modest in the context of the CA as a whole. Consequently, it would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset. While I accept that the enhanced internal living accommodation and views over the river would be a benefit to the appellant, No 9 is a private dwelling and no public benefits have been demonstrated that would outweigh the harm to the CA. I therefore conclude that the appeal scheme would be in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. By virtue of the harm to the host property and the CA, the proposal would conflict with Policies DS1, DS3 and EN3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document Adopted July 2017. These require, among other things, that development contributes to high quality places, and respects and reinforces distinctive local character, taking account of relevant guidance including conservation area appraisals and reviews.

11. My attention has been drawn to numerous planning permissions elsewhere in the conservation area. However, full details of those schemes are not before me and I cannot be certain that any of them are directly comparable to the appeal scheme. With particular regard to the nearby properties, Nos 1, 3 and 5 Denton Road, evidence submitted with the appeal indicates that they were either considered in a different policy context, were altered without planning permission, or were found to accord with the development plan. They are not therefore directly comparable to, and they do not provide a justification for, the appeal scheme. Each scheme must in any case be considered on its own merits. In this case, I have found that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, including the CA.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR