



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2020 by C McDonagh BA (Hons), MA

**by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 08 June 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/20/3245679**

**4 Riverside Cottages, Keighley Road, Silsden BD20 0EH**

- 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 Ian Boulton against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
  - The application Ref 19/03990/HOU, dated 20 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2019.
  - The development proposed is the conversion of multiple pitched roof to double pitched roof to row of cottages.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and street scene.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises six back-to-back, two-storey stone cottages. The two rows are offset from one another, with one half projecting closer towards Keighley Road. Both rows have dual pitched slate roofs. One half has maintained an external stone appearance, while the other is currently painted in an off-white colour.
5. The immediate area contains a mix of building styles and uses, which has occurred as the area has evolved. There are two larger, detached stone houses adjacent of a similar age, while on the other side is a more modern flat-roof building of unknown use. On the opposite side of Keighley Road lies a warehouse building.
6. It appears that the cottages were constructed in relation to the former Becks Mill in the mid-late 19<sup>th</sup> century. While they have been subject to some external alteration over time, their historic use as workers cottages is reflected in their modest size and scale. The building is well proportioned, and the original roof

form is a characteristic feature that allows the cottages to be legible as two joined but distinct rows. As such, whilst I acknowledge that the Mill no longer exists and the physical context of the buildings has changed, and even though the buildings are not listed or within a conservation area, the character and appearance of these traditional buildings makes a positive contribution to the area.

7. The proposal would add substantial mass and bulk to the buildings, with the infilling between the two pitches and the raising of the ridge making the buildings appear disproportionate and top heavy. The awkward arrangement of the outlying section facing the road would add to its incongruity. Moreover, the distinctive original roof form would be lost and as such the character and legibility of the cottages as two distinct rows would be significantly eroded. Taken in combination, the proposal would harm the host buildings and thereby the character of the area as a result.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention via photographs to numerous examples of other building styles and roof forms in Silsden. Whilst it is not uncommon for a town to feature a range of styles, this would not justify the harm I have identified to the appeal buildings. I also noted the roof forms of the modern housing estate off Belton Lane. However, the context and circumstances of that development differ from, and are not directly comparable to, the proposal before me.
9. I understand the works are intended to ease the issues associated with maintenance and to offer increased storage space required if the area floods. However, while I appreciate this would be of benefit to occupants in both scenarios, I have limited information before me regarding these issues. This limits the weight I can give the matters as benefits of the scheme.
10. To conclude on the main issue, as set out above, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host buildings and local area. Consequently, it fails to comply with the requirements of Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document (CSDPD), which seek to ensure design is informed by a good understanding of the site/area and its context. In addition, the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which states design should be sympathetic to local character.

### **Recommendation**

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*C McDonagh*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*S Ashworth*

INSPECTOR