



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2023

by A A Phillips BA(Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI AssocIHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/F/22/3309505

Street House Farm, The Street, Addingham, Ilkley, West Yorkshire LS29 0JY

- The appeal is made under section 39 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Michael Calvert against a listed building enforcement notice issued by City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The enforcement notice was issued on 13 September 2022.
 - The contravention of listed building control alleged in the notice is the alteration of a Listed Building by the construction of a timber clad extension.
 - The requirements of the notice are to restore the building to its former state by taking the following steps:
 - Step 1 - Demolish and remove from the Listed Building the unauthorised extension.
 - Step 2 - Remove from the Land all materials arising from the demolition of the unauthorised extension.
 - Step 3 - Remove from the Listed Building the security lighting and plastic drain pipes which are shown on the front elevation of the Listed Building in Photograph 1.
 - Step 4 - Reinstall the quoin stones on the upper left hand of the front elevation of the Listed Building shown in Photograph 1 using course natural gritstone to match the existing quoin stones and preserve the symmetry of the said front elevation.
 - Step 5 - To the front and side elevation of the Listed Building shown in Photograph 1 adjoining the unauthorised Extension, carry out the infilling of any gaps using course Delph natural stone and mortar joints up to existing roof level of the Listed Building.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is six calendar months.
 - The appeal is made on the grounds set out in section 39(1) (e) and (h) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.
-

Summary of Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and the listed building enforcement notice is upheld, and listed building consent is refused for the retention of the works carried out in contravention of section 9 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 as amended.

Site and Surroundings

2. Street House Farm is situated on the south western edge of the settlement of Addingham and consists of a main dwelling, outbuilding and gardens. It is within a predominantly residential area and surrounded by residential development on all sides. Street House Farm and the adjacent property known as Street House Cottage are both Grade II Listed Buildings. The Arches and an attached outbuilding are also Grade II Listed. These are thought to be the original farm buildings associated with Street House Farm which was originally

situated in open agricultural land and accessed by The Street which would have been a minor track.

3. Street Farm House and Street House Cottage were first listed in January 1985 and are described as early seventeenth century house with later alterations being a later eighteenth century cottage. Built in coursed rubble with a dressed stone cottage with stone slate roof. The buildings are two storeys and the south elevation has an addition to the left end with two bays of windows with plain stone surrounds and slightly projecting sills. Other notable features include mullioned windows, four light double-chamfered mullioned window to left of inserted French window, two eighteenth century windows over to first floor, quoins at the junction with the end bay which breaks forward slightly and has two chamfered windows formerly of two lights lacking mullions with a stepped light opened between. There are coped gables with kneelers and stacks, two other stacks to the ridge, the rear has an eighteenth century doorway with raised monolithic jambs to left of outshut with three light double-chamfered mullioned window.
4. The small, detached stone walled building with stone tiled roof is situated to the north east of Street Farm House and has a single doorway facing the gravel courtyard. It is situated within the curtilage of the Listed Building and as such is protected by the main listing. A relatively large single storey extension has been added to the outbuilding to provide garaging for vehicles with additional domestic storage. The extension incorporates vertical timber boarding with a cedar shingle pitched roof.

The appeal on ground (e)

5. The ground of appeal is that listed building consent ought to be granted for the works and therefore the main issue is the effect of the works on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.
6. Section 16(2) of the Act requires the decision-maker, in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works affecting a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses.
7. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. This is reiterated in Policy EN3 of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan requires that all proposals for development conserve and where appropriate enhance the heritage significance and setting of Bradford's heritage assets.
8. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to that asset's conservation. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset, or development within its setting.

9. The appeal building is a relatively small and simple single storey structure and the extension measures approximately 10.2 metres by approximately 6 metres. Its overall height is approximately 3.4 metres. It has been attached to the western elevation of the historic outbuilding and the attachment to the listed outbuilding has caused some damage to a section of the quoins and stone work has evidently been removed. The damage is only relatively minor, but is nonetheless of great importance and significance, constituting loss of historic fabric.
10. The overall scale of the extension in relation to the host building is significant and it completely subsumes the side elevation, dominating it and detracting from its overall architectural and historical integrity as a small vernacular outbuilding. The vertical timber boarding are a conspicuous distraction from the listed building and are an inappropriate and jarring contrast with the traditional materials used in the host building. This is harmful to its character, appearance and historical form.
11. In addition, UPVC rainwater goods and a security camera have been added to the building and these are undue, modern and visually conspicuous additions which are at odds with the stone outbuilding and detract from its overall quality as an outbuilding of historical merit. The main dwelling also has plastic guttering which appears to have been in place for some time. However, that does not mean to say that it is an appropriate material to use on an historic building and, in any case that is not the subject of this current appeal.
12. From the approach to the appeal site along The Street the extension is mainly screened by the original outbuilding. However, the works are close to Listed Buildings and are highly visible from the immediate surroundings and the relationship between the outbuilding and the nearby Listed Buildings has been compromised by filling in space that would otherwise have been important within the farm complex. I am aware that the agricultural function no longer exists, but the new arrangement it is at odds with the historic form and layout of the area and when combined with its overall design, scale and materiality the works are discordant with the historic setting, causing harm to the listed buildings.
13. The appellant has drawn my attention to recent modern residential development in the locality and the effect this has had on the historic environment, locally. It is suggested that the works before me are relatively minor in comparison to other development that has taken place. That may be the case, but the siting of the extension before me fractures important relationships between listed buildings and the main listed Street House Farm, in particular.
14. The stone outbuilding which has been extended, its relationship with other historic buildings in the locality, its age, materials, quality, design and overall form all contribute positively to the special architectural and historical interest of the Listed Building and its significance as an important heritage asset. I find the harm to be less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.
15. Under such circumstances, the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the works. The appellant submits that the extension provides garaging and storage space associated with the main dwellinghouse and therefore provides benefits to the property by covering

vehicles and domestic paraphernalia in the setting of the Listed Building and enhancing views of the group of historic buildings. I can see that would be a marginal benefit, but it would be more of a private rather than public benefit. Furthermore, there is insufficient evidence that the covered space provided could not have been achieved in a more sensitive way.

16. Given the above, and in the absence of any clearly defined public benefit, I conclude that the works have a harmful effect on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, the Framework and would conflict with Policy EN3 of the LP. As such the appeal on ground (e) does not succeed.

The appeal on ground (h)

17. The ground of appeal is that the period specified in the notice as the period within the steps required by the notice are to be taken falls short of what should reasonably be allowed. Six calendar months would be sufficient to demolish and remove the extension, remove materials from the land, remove the security lighting and plastic drain pipes, reinstate the quoin stones and carry out infilling to any gaps. The twelve month compliance period suggested by the appellant would be excessive having regard to the ongoing harm caused by the works. Therefore the appeal on ground (h) does not succeed.

Formal Decision

18. I dismiss the appeal and uphold the listed building enforcement notice and refuse listed building consent for the retention of the works carried out in contravention of section 9 of the planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.

A A Phillips

INSPECTOR