



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2020

by J M Tweddle BSc(Hons) MSc(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C2708/D/19/3241895

17 Pendle Street, Skipton BD23 1SN

- 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 S and Mrs M Akhtar against the decision of Craven District Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/20607/HH, dated 7 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension and front dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council does not raise any concern with the proposed two storey rear extension. My deliberations and decision are therefore confined to the proposed dormer roof extension to the front of the property.
3. The Craven Local Plan 2012-2032 (the CLP) was formally adopted by the Council on 12 November 2019 and now forms part of the statutory development plan for the district. Therefore, I have had due regard to the newly adopted plan in my decision. In doing so, I am satisfied that this has not prejudiced either party as emerging CLP policies were cited in the reason for refusal and the appellant has had the opportunity to comment during the appeal proceedings.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, including the setting of the Skipton Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace dwelling which forms part of a row of nine properties, all with traditional dual pitched roofs. The unaltered front facing roof slope of the terraced row, including the appeal property, provides a distinct and uninterrupted roof-scape that is prominent in public views, and presently there are no front facing dormers along the street. The surrounding area is characterised by similar Victorian and Edwardian period terraced properties which similarly display a strong sense of uniformity in their layout and traditional roof form.

6. The proposal would see the introduction of a dormer roof extension set down from the main ridge line, positioned centrally on the front facing roof slope and set up from the eaves. Despite the use of matching materials, the roof extension would lack architectural subtlety in its box-like design and would result in a prominent and incongruous feature, disrupting the continuous linear feature of the front roof slope. This would significantly alter the form and appearance of the host property, and terraced row, in an uncharacteristic manner that would harmfully depart from the uniformity and cohesive character and appearance of the area.
7. The boundary of Skipton Conservation Area (CA) is located to the north of the appeal site alongside the Leeds and Liverpool canal. The CA is predominantly focused on the historic core of the town and the canal corridor, with its significance in part derived from the town's industrial heritage and associated development. Owing to the elevated position of the canal towpath, the roof-scape formed by the appeal site and the surrounding terraced streets are clearly visible from the CA.
8. These terraced streets historically housed mill workers and demonstrate the close association of industrial development and housing in the mid-nineteenth century. In this context, they form an important historical narrative as to the growth of this part of the town and therefore provide a valued historic townscape setting in which the CA can be experienced and understood. Furthermore, the Skipton Conservation Area Appraisal (2018) identifies Pendle Street and the surrounding terraced housing as an important part of the setting of the CA which adds positively to its townscape character. The proposal would introduce a discordant feature that would disrupt the existing traditional roof-scape of Pendle Street. It would therefore harm the setting of the CA and consequently cause harm to the significance of it.
9. Policy ENV2 of the CLP states that harm to designated heritage assets will be permitted only where this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. This is echoed by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) at paragraphs 195 and 196 which set out a similar approach. In the terms of the Framework, the harm to the significance of the CA as a whole, by virtue of the harm to its setting as a result of the proposed dormer, would be 'less than substantial'. It is nevertheless incumbent upon me to give considerable importance and weight to such harm. In this case, the proposal would increase the living accommodation of the property for the benefit of its occupiers, but this is of limited public benefit and does not, therefore, outweigh the harm to the CA.
10. Consequently, I find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, including the setting of the CA. It follows, therefore, that the proposal would harm the significance of the CA without sufficient public benefit to outweigh this harm. This is contrary to Policy ENV2 of the CLP and the associated provisions of the Framework which together seek to conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the historic environment, including the legacy of terraced housing associated with the textile industry.

Other Matters

11. My attention has been drawn to other box style dormer roof extensions on houses in the streets surrounding the appeal property. I do not have the full

details of these other schemes before me and therefore do not know the exact circumstances that led to these permissions being granted. However, the examples I have been referred to demonstrate the harmful interruption such features make to the street scene, diminishing the original architectural integrity of the host property. Thus, they serve to illustrate quite clearly why a similar development would be unwelcome at the appeal site. It is also evident that these other developments would have pre-dated the current development plan, against which I must consider this appeal. In any case, I have considered the appeal on its own merits and reached my own conclusion.

12. I acknowledge the lack of objection from the Town Council, but this is a neutral factor in my determination and does not, therefore, outweigh the harm I have found.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons I have set out, the appeal is dismissed.

Jeff Tweddle

INSPECTOR