
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2021

by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/21/3278944
5 Low Mill Lane, Addingham LS29 0QP

- 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 Stacy Ormerod against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01539/HOU, dated 18 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is to add a dormer to the rear of the property as per plans.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the course of the appeal, the revised National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) (the Framework) was published. I consider that there have been no fundamental changes relevant to the main issue in this appeal and therefore no party will be prejudiced by my consideration of it.

Main Issues

3. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt. The Council have considered the proposal in the context of Paragraph 149(c) of the Framework and concluded the dormer extension would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Based on my own observations and the evidence submitted, I have no reason to disagree.
4. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and local area, including the Addingham Conservation Area (ACA).

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a mid-terrace cottage with a single-storey rear extension. The property is of simple form and constructed from traditional materials prevalent in the local area. The appeal terrace and the cottages comprising it are modest in scale and have retained some original features such as the layout of fenestration and roof forms.
6. The design of the dormer would have little set down from the ridge or set back from the eaves of the host building. Although I understand head height may be a consideration of Building Regulations, this is not a planning matter and the

proposal would lack subordination and appear to dominate the rear roof of the host building. This would leave little of the original rear section of the roof remaining which is a positive feature of the host terrace as a whole. This harm would be compounded by the use of modern materials which would jar with the more traditional appearance of the host building.

7. It is argued that the rear roof is not prominent from Low Mill Lane or views from Ilkley Road, which is over some distance. However, the dormer would be visible from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties. In any event, the prominence of the proposal in visual terms does not negate the impacts upon the character of the host building and local area.
8. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. The Framework sets out at paragraph 199 that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to that asset's conservation.
9. I have concluded that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the host building and the local area within which it is located, in particular the roofscape of the host terrace. The ACA derives part of its significance from its vernacular architecture and its historic development, including the advent of mills in the industrial revolution. Given the name of the cottages there is a historic association with these mills. Along with its architectural style, the host building and terrace therefore make a positive contribution to the ACA given this significance. Given the harm identified to the host building and immediate area, there would also be some limited harm to the significance of the ACA.
10. In the context of the Framework, the level of harm I have identified would be less than substantial. Paragraph 202 of the Framework states that where a development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
11. I have considered the benefits presented before me by the appellant and supporting comments of neighbours. Additional living space would be of private benefit rather than public benefit, although I do understand the desire of the appellant to seek this. I am informed that the ACA appraisal identifies 1-5 Low Mill Lane as having a negative impact on the Conservation Area. I do not have this document or relevant extracts before me, although from my observations I disagree with this assessment. Despite the appellant having made improvements to the external elevations of the building, as the appellant agrees the property enhances the ACA rather than having a negative effect. In any event, making improvements to the building would not in turn justify allowing subsequent harm. As such, there are no public benefits of the proposal sufficient to outweigh the harm the ACA I have identified.
12. Given the above, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building and terrace and would harm the significance of the ACA. It would therefore conflict with Policies EN3, DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District: Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted July 2017) and Policy ANDP2 of the Addingham Neighbourhood Development Plan (made January 2020). 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.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property, local area and the ACA. This harm would not be overcome by the lack of harm that would arise to the living conditions of occupiers of adjoining properties as a lack of harm is neutral in the planning balance. As such it would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

INSPECTOR