



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2022

by Diane Cragg Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/22/3298045

The Coach House, Upper Parish Ghyll Lane, ILKLEY LS29 9NX

- 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 Rob Whitemore against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00394/HOU, dated 28 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is addition of gable dormer window to north plane of roof, recladding of existing flat roofed dormer in zinc, insertion of external doors in east elevation, and replacement and enlargement of two rooflights in west roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The drawings were amended during the application process. The Council confirms that the car port was omitted from the original scheme. The design of the dormer was also amended. For clarity the drawings I am considering as part of this appeal are: Drawing No 566-010 - REV D and Drawing No566-011-REV D, since I understand from the submissions before me that those are the versions on which the Council based its decision.
3. I have taken the appellant's name from the appeal form as it is not stated on the application form. Further, I have taken the description of the development from the appeal form which acknowledges the removal of the car port from the appeal scheme, and I have determined the appeal accordingly.
4. The appeal site is within Ilkley Conservation Area (CA) wherein I have a statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.

Main Issue

5. The Council does not raise any concerns about the recladding of the existing flat roofed dormer, insertion of external doors or the enlargement of the roof lights. Following my site visit I am satisfied that these elements of the appeal scheme would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and I see no reason to take a different view to the Council on these parts of the proposed scheme.
6. Therefore, the main issue is whether the proposed dormer window would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

Reasons

7. The appeal property is a detached two storey Victorian coach house formally associated with the adjacent Thorpe Hall, a grade II listed building, and located within the CA. The Coach House is sited close to Upper Parish Ghyll Lane frontage and is a prominent structure from this road and from Queen's Drive.
8. The appeal site is within character area 5 Victorian and Edwardian suburbs in the Ilkley Conservation Area Appraisal (CA Appraisal). The significance of the Coach House derives from its association with the expansion of Ilkley in the Victorian and Edwardian period. The architecture of the period provides visual quality and structures are harmonious in terms of design, scale and materials contributing to a high-quality environment. The slate roof of the Coach House with decorative ridge tiles, and tall chimney stacks and a mixture of gable and hipped roofs with generous overhanging eaves, complements the robust stone materials of the walls. The Coach House contributes to the significance of the CA and positively contributes to its character and appearance.
9. Although the dormer design is intended to create contrast and has evolved to be set back from the eaves and ridge line, it would project out to the extent that it would obscure the roof detail along the ridge line and detract from the shape and form of the building. The use of zinc and the dormer width and height would not harmonise, nor would it result in an aesthetically pleasing contrast, with the Coach House roof.
10. As the appellant acknowledges the Coach House is prominent in south facing views along Upper Parish Ghyll Lane, where its north elevation is emphasised by the gradient of the land and rises above the neighbouring property. Even though these views are not key views or vistas in the CA Appraisal, due to the scale of the dormer, the resulting roof profile and the proposed materials, the dormer would be a highly visible and incongruous addition to the roof. Consequently, the dormer window would erode the significance of the CA, and its character and appearance and would look harmfully out of place, although the harm would be less than substantial.
11. I note the examples of other dormer windows on Victorian/Edwardian properties in the CA, however, few of these are in contrasting materials and their designs do not indicate that a modern intervention in the roof of the Coach House would complement the architecture of the building.
12. Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset (in this case the CA) should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposed development. Whilst the other elements of the design would preserve the CA, none of these would positively enhance the building and therefore do not amount to public benefits of the scheme. There are no other public benefits that would outweigh the great weight that should be given to the asset's conservation.
13. Moreover, the proposal would conflict with Policies EN3, DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document where these policies collectively seek to achieve good design and proactively preserve, protect, and enhance the character and appearance of designated heritage assets.

Other Matters

14. Section 66 (1) of the Act requires that, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, special regard must be given to the desirability of preserving the building, or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
15. Thorpe Hall, a grade II listed building, is adjacent to the appeal site. Due to the intervening boundary treatment and the position of the hipped end to the Coach House there would be very limited intervisibility between the proposed dormer and Thorpe Hall. Although the other alterations would be seen in the context of Thorpe Hall there would be limited visual change to the building's elevations because of these. I am satisfied that the development would not harm the setting of the listed building; its setting would be preserved.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal, as a whole, would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR