



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2019

by E Symmons BSc (Hons), MSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/19/3232869

19 Hunters Green, Cullingworth, Bingley BD13 5JH

- 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 Mrs M Jagger against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01694/HOU, dated 15 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is for a replacement porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt;
 - the effect of the development on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it;
 - if it is inappropriate development, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

Reasons

Whether Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt

3. Paragraph 145 of the National Planning Policy Framework¹ (The Framework) states that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate, other than for listed exceptions. The exception outlined in Paragraph 145 (c) states that extensions should not represent a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. Policy SC7 of the Bradford District Local Plan 2017² (Local Plan) recognises the value of the Green Belt and seeks its protection. The Householder Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sets an upper limit to the size and position of

¹ National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019.

² Local Plan for the Bradford District. Core Strategy Development Plan Document. Adopted July 2017.

extensions within the Green Belt as no more than a 30% increase over and above the original cubic volume of the dwelling. This sets out upper limits.

4. The Council state that in total, the volume of additions to the dwelling have approximately doubled the size of the property when compared with its original size and this figure has not been disputed by the appellant. The proposal, for a replacement extension for the side porch, is reported by the appellant to be just over nine cubic metres and therefore of a similar volume to that being demolished. However, only limited measurement details have been provided. Although drawing 01 shows the volume of the current porch as nine cubic metres, drawing 02-B showing the proposal, gives no volume measurement and neither plan shows the actual or proposed floorspace or height dimensions.
5. The proposal would result in a replacement structure which would have a lower height, but greater width and footprint than the existing porch. The current property has been substantially extended over time and in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I have no certainty that the proposal does not further increase the size of the property resulting in a disproportionate addition over and above the original size of the dwelling. Furthermore, I do not consider that any of the remaining exceptions within paragraph 145 apply to this development and it would therefore constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

Openness

6. Hunter's Green is a small development accessed off the B6429 and surrounded by countryside with open views. The stone-built appeal property sits within a relatively large plot behind a front drive/forecourt area. There is a side and rear garden, which is enclosed by a stone wall. The existing porch is to the east side of the dwelling adjacent to a shorter section of stone wall which sits between the property and the gate to the garden. The existing porch has a pitched roof which matches the orientation of the main roof. This has the effect, when viewed from the front or rear, of blending the narrow porch into the building.
7. Despite having a lower roof height, the proposed roof design would no longer match that of the main roof. It would slope out from the side elevation in a single pitch which would have the effect of visually elongating the building line. This would increase its prominence when compared with the current situation. When viewed from both within and outwith the property, the replacement structure would appear more prominent, particularly when viewed from the east where a larger expanse of roof would be visible. Additionally, to accommodate the increased width, a section of the stone wall would need to be removed. This would be replaced by the extension which is a higher structure.
8. Due to the proposed design, the extension would have a greater impact upon the openness of the Green Belt than the existing structure. This would conflict with Policy SC7 of the Local Plan and advice contained within the SPD. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. All development must preserve this openness and in accordance with paragraph 144 of the Framework, the harm to the openness of the Green Belt I have identified must be afforded substantial weight.

Other considerations

9. The appellant states that there are no designated sanitary facilities on the ground floor which poses difficulties for both the current occupier and visiting relatives with disabilities. Although I am sympathetic to this aim, no additional details relating to this need have been submitted. Additionally, there is no evidence to suggest that other ways to achieve this aim have been investigated and discounted. As such, although the proposal would be of benefit to the living conditions of the occupants, I afford this consideration only limited weight within the decision.

Other Matters

10. I have noted that the appellant is dissatisfied with the Council's handling of the planning application. However, these are matters which would need to be pursued with the Council. I confirm that I have regard only to the planning merits of this case.

Green Belt Planning Balance

11. The proposal has been found to constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the Framework indicates that this is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The harm I have identified to the openness of the Green Belt also carries substantial weight.
12. The other considerations which have been discussed carry limited weight in favour of the proposal and do not outweigh the totality of the harm due to the loss of openness to the Green Belt. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist. The proposal conflicts with the Local Plan and the Green Belt policies within the Framework when taken as a whole.
13. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Symmons

INSPECTOR