



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 25 November 2020

by Jillian Rann BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/Y/20/3259295

14 The Rookery, Bolton Road, Addingham LS29 0NP

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr James Crosbie against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02247/LBC, dated 14 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 August 2020.
 - The works proposed are canopy over rear door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council and the appellant refer to the canopy having already been installed and a canopy was in place over the rear door at the time of my visit. I have considered the appeal on the basis that consent is sought to retain the works.
3. The appeal property is part of a terrace of cottages which is grade II listed. I am mindful of my duties under section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) and have considered the appeal accordingly. The site is also in a conservation area. The Council's reason for refusal does not refer to the effects of the works on the conservation area. However, other interested parties have raised concerns in that regard. In the light of my statutory duties under section 72(1) of the Act I have also considered the effect of the works on the conservation area.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the special interest of the grade II listed building known as '10, 12, 14 and 16, The Rookery' and the character or appearance of the Addingham Conservation Area (ACA).

Reasons

5. The appeal relates to a grade II listed terrace of stone cottages which date from around the turn of the 19th century. The terrace was historically made up of 8 back-to-back cottages but is now a row of 4 through-terraced houses.
6. The submissions indicate that the cottages historically served as textile workers' housing. They sit across a small courtyard from another stone terrace of similar cottages, at the end of which a former cloth weaving workshop has been retained. The appeal building therefore has historic interest as an

- example of workers' housing associated with the local textile manufacturing industry.
7. The appeal terrace and the cottages within it are modest in scale and simple in appearance. Although the listed building has been the subject of various alterations over the years, it has not been extended. The strong linear form and the simple, unadorned appearance of this terrace of vernacular workers' cottages have thus been preserved.
 8. Furthermore, despite alterations to the size and appearance of some windows, the pattern of the building's openings has generally been preserved. The heavy stone heads and jambs to many of those openings remain, including to what are now the rear entrance doors of each of the 4 adjoining cottages. The simple form and uninterrupted rhythm of the building's openings, including those unaltered, paired rear doors, preserve the continuity and legibility of what was formerly a principal elevation to the historic back-to-back cottages. The heads to those door openings and others in the building and the neighbouring terrace at The Rookery also display a distinctive tooling pattern in horizontal bands which, the submissions indicate, appears to have been a local mason's mark.
 9. Insofar as it relates to this appeal, the listed building derives historic and architectural interest from those openings and from the elements of their historic fabric and distinctive detailing that have been preserved.
 10. The ACA encompasses the village's historic centre along Main Street as well as areas of historic stone housing and open land around it. The stone terraced shops and houses on the approach to the site along Bolton Road from Main Street are generally well-preserved and have maintained their simple, traditional appearance and detailing despite some alterations.
 11. As the appeal terrace is positioned perpendicular to Bolton Road, its rear elevation is evident as part of that wider street scene when travelling out of the village. The terrace and its neighbour across the adjacent courtyard at The Rookery are also visible in the context of those surrounding historic terraces from footpaths across the adjacent open space within the ACA at Manor Garth. With their well-preserved, simple linear form and those elements of their traditional detailing which have been maintained, the appeal building and its neighbour at The Rookery make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the ACA.
 12. The proposed canopy may be of relatively limited depth. However, it represents a discordant feature which disrupts the distinctively simple, uninterrupted linear form of the listed building in this case. Despite the use of traditional, sympathetic materials in its construction, the canopy is an uncharacteristically decorative feature that is inconsistent with the simple form and detailing of these historic workers' cottages. The lower edges of the canopy also obscure parts of the historic stone door head and its distinctive linear tooling pattern.
 13. Therefore, the canopy does not preserve the legibility of what was formerly a principal elevation of the listed terraced cottages. It also obscures and erodes the integrity of distinctive aspects of its historic detailing. Those effects would not be overcome by changing the design of the canopy or the colour of the paintwork as has been suggested. The works would therefore cause harm to the special interest of the listed building and would not preserve the character or appearance of the ACA.

14. I have been referred to a similar canopy to the rear of the adjoining cottage, 16 The Rookery, which was present at the time of my visit. However, the Council has advised that canopy does not have the benefit of consent. On that basis I afford its existence little weight.
15. My attention has also been drawn to canopies on other residential properties elsewhere in the village. However, I do not have full details before me of those fixtures, the circumstances in which they were installed or whether those other buildings referred to are listed. Consequently, I cannot be certain that they were directly comparable to those in the case before me. In any event, I have considered the appeal on its own planning merits and the presence of those other canopies elsewhere does not alter my conclusions regarding the harm that would arise from the specific proposal before me.
16. The harm arising would be less than substantial. Nevertheless, I give considerable importance and weight to that harm and to the presumption that preservation is desirable. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires any such harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
17. It has been suggested that the canopy would provide some protection from the elements, including to the building's façade. However, I have no compelling evidence to indicate that the building's external walls are at significant risk from weathering. Whilst the canopy may provide some shelter for those entering or leaving the dwelling, any such benefits would be limited and largely private in nature. Therefore, the weight I give to any public benefits arising from the scheme is limited and insufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.
18. Given the above, the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the grade II listed building known as '10, 12, 14 and 16, The Rookery'. It would also not preserve the character or appearance of the ACA. It would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the Framework. It would also conflict with Policy EN3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District: Core Strategy Development Plan Document and Policy ANDP2 of the Addingham Neighbourhood Development Plan. Those policies require proposals to conserve heritage assets and that works in the ACA should be designed sensitively to ensure that the special characteristics of the area are preserved or enhanced.
19. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jillian Rann
INSPECTOR