
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2022

by S Hunt BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/Y/21/3285387

4 Moorside Road, Eccleshill, Bradford BD2 2EU

- 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 Adam Coope against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03880/LBC, dated 22 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2021.
 - The works proposed are roof tiles replaced with concrete tiles which match adjoining properties.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of works in the banner heading above is the one used by the Council, which is a shortened version of that on the application form.
3. The works have been carried out and the concrete tiles are in place.
4. As the appeal relates to a listed building I have had special regard to section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the works preserve the Grade II listed building, 2 and 4 Moorside Road (Ref. 1132963), and any of the features of special or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

6. This appeal relates to no. 4 Moorside Road (No. 4) and the effect of the works on the special interest of the building as one of a pair of simple adjoining cottages dating from around 1800. It is a building of modest scale and simple form. Together with its neighbour, it is reflective of the traditional materials and construction methods of the period. The cottages occupy a prominent position at the apex of Moorside Road with Stone Hall Road, and are bounded by both streets. Notwithstanding modern replacement materials, the cottages positively contribute to the distinctiveness of the local area.

7. Given the above, I find that the special interest of the listed building, insofar as it relates to this appeal, is primarily associated with its construction from traditional materials typical of the period.
8. The tiles on the roof of No. 4 were replaced some time ago with 'Marley' concrete slate effect tiles. Whilst no photographs are supplied of the original tiles, the use of stone slate is noted in the 1983 list description. On my site visit I saw numerous other examples of similar historic buildings in the vicinity which retain stone slate roof tiles, including buildings within the adjoining terrace of 6 to 12 Moorside Road. I have no doubt that the traditional materials that formerly characterised this roof would have made a positive contribution to the special interest of the listed building and that their loss has caused significant harm.
9. This is because modern 'Marley' tiles are very regular in shape and colour, and have a more uniform appearance than the stone tiles on nearby properties. They do not have the rich texture and colour variation of the natural material which they would have replaced and are consequently unreflective of the local distinctiveness of the area. The harmful effect is heightened by the prominent location of the building. Consequently, I agree with my colleague in the previous appeal decision¹ that the new roof covering is wholly inappropriate to a building of this age and type, and that the alterations have failed to preserve the special interest of the building.
10. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of development on significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to their conservation. Paragraph 200 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have a clear and convincing justification. In this instance I find the harm to be less than substantial given that the alterations the subject of this appeal are limited to the roof. Nevertheless, I give this harm considerable importance and weight.
11. Under such circumstances, paragraph 202 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including securing its optimal viable use. The appellant cites the cost and availability of stone slate, and is of the opinion that the alterations are of benefit because the materials offer modern levels of insulation.
12. I accept that concrete roof tiles may well have been cheaper, and could be more effective in insulating the building. Any investment that helps to prolong the life of a listed building could be seen as a public benefit, but not if it means that the building's special interest is compromised. Moreover, this is not the only way in which improved thermal efficiency could have been achieved. For example, more sympathetic secondary insulation could have been used that did not involve the wholesale destruction of highly prominent historic fabric. Consequently, this limited public benefit is clearly outweighed by the harm I have identified.
13. I acknowledge the use of similar tiles on the immediately adjacent properties and others in the vicinity, but I note that the Council states that there appear to be no consents for these works on the nearby listed buildings. In any event,

¹ APP/W4705/Y/18/3194050

such alterations do not justify the harm that has been caused to the appeal building.

14. Given the above, and in the absence of any significant public benefit, I conclude that the works have failed to preserve the special historic interest of the listed building and this fails to satisfy the requirements of the Act and paragraph 199 of the Framework. Insofar as relevant, it also conflicts with parts C3 and E of Policy EN3 of the Bradford District Local Plan Core Strategy 2017 which seeks to conserve the distinctiveness of architectural styles and palette of materials in the District, and seeks to ensure that alterations do not have any adverse effect upon the special interest of the building and are appropriate in terms of materials.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Susan Hunt

Inspector