



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2023

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/GW4705/W/22/3310266

Street House Grange, The Street, Addingham, Bradford LS29 0JY

- 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 and Mrs Hall against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01180/FUL, dated 15 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is construction of detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has advised that the address on the application form was incorrect. I have therefore taken the address, in the banner heading above, from the appeal form and decision notice.
3. The appellant has included an indicative alternative plan within the appeal documentation. The plans show a materially amended scheme to that which was before the Council when it made its decision. I consider, at this stage, that taking such a plan into consideration would potentially prejudice the interests of interested parties, although I note that the appellant has not requested that I do so. I have therefore determined the appeal having regard to the plans upon which the Council made its decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - Whether the development would preserve the setting of Street House Farm and Street House Cottage, Grade II listed buildings;
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - The effect of the development on highway safety having regard to the width of the access and the adequacy of provision for turning by service, delivery and refuse vehicles.

Reasons

Setting of listed buildings

5. The appeal proposal involves the erection of a dwelling to the rear of two Grade II listed buildings, Street House Farm (the House) and the attached Street House Cottage (the Cottage). According to the listed building description the House dates from early 17th Century and the Cottage from the late 18th Century. They are two storey and externally they are constructed in coursed rubble with dressed stone to the cottage. The listed buildings features include bay windows with plain stone surrounds and chamfered mullioned windows.
6. The House and the Cottage are sited between the appeal site and a further Grade II listed building, the Arches. The House and the Cottage are robust and modestly detailed buildings which reflect their original role as a farmhouse and associated structures. In this sense their significance and special interest comes from their historical and evidential value in demonstrating how this area has developed.
7. The appeal site previously formed part of the garden to the listed buildings and was surrounded by open pasture. This land no longer has a functional relationship with the listed buildings, being in a different ownership. However, the setting of a listed building can be more extensive than its curtilage. In this case the setting provided by the appeal site contributes to the significance of the listed buildings by providing a sense of their historical relationship with the wider open environment that previously existed. The appeal site is seen as part of the visual context for the listed buildings and is part of the surroundings in which they are experienced. This conclusion is not significantly undermined by the presence of the hedge and fence defining the boundary line as a visual relationship remains.
8. The contribution of the appeal site to this setting is particularly important as little of the wider open context of the listed buildings remain following the recent construction of residential development to the north and east.
9. The appeal proposal would introduce a substantial detached dwelling into this area which would significantly erode the open setting of the listed buildings. By undermining the sense of the historic context for these buildings it would cause harm to their significance.
10. Therefore, I find that the proposed development lies within the setting of listed buildings. As such, there is a duty imposed by Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requiring decisions makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building. Policy EN3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (CS) includes content which reflects Section 66(1).
11. In view of the above, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interests of the Grade II listed buildings, which would be contrary to the requirements of Section 66(1) of the Act. As such, the proposal will harm the special interest and significance of this designated heritage asset contrary to CS Policy EN3.
12. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates, at paragraph 199, that great weight should be given to conservation of heritage assets. At paragraph 200 the Framework states that any harm to the

significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. In finding harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Whilst the Council contends that the harm would be substantial, I am mindful that this is a very high test. In my judgement, the harm arising from the proposal to the setting of the listed buildings would be less than substantial. Even so, this still amounts to a serious harm which requires clear and convincing justification.

13. Under such circumstances, paragraph 202 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The appellant has not set out any public benefits. Even if I take into account that the proposed dwelling would make a small contribution to the supply of housing, this does not amount to a public benefit that is sufficient to outweigh the harm found.
14. Given the above and in the absence of sufficient public benefits that outweigh the harm, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the setting of Street House Farm and Street House Cottage, Grade II listed buildings.

Character and appearance

15. The area comprises modern residential development, in addition to the listed buildings described above. The appearance of the dwellings within this development is broadly consistent, being of two storey stone construction. The adjoining Street House Grange reflects this character, but also includes render at first floor.
16. The proposal would result in a large, detached dwelling directly to the rear of both listed buildings on slightly higher ground. It would have a linear form and would be of a height comparable to the listed buildings. However, the design of the dwelling includes features, such as the randomly placed dormers with vertically emphasised windows, large areas of glazing at ground floor and the glazed corner, that are not reflective of the appearance of the listed buildings. In addition, the plans lack details such as the placing and extent of the render, the eaves details and whether the windows and doors are recessed. Consequently, the proposed dwelling would be sympathetic to the appearance of the listed buildings that lie near the appeal site. The proposed dwelling, the associated driveway and domestic paraphernalia would also materially reduce what remains of the open context of the listed buildings.
17. Whilst the linear form, height and design details of the proposed dwelling does not reflect the two-storey appearance of the modern development such a contrast would not, in itself, be harmful. Nonetheless, the proposed development would have a significant negative effect on the setting of the listed building and would thereby harm the appearance of the wider area.
18. Accordingly, the appeal proposal is harmful to the character and appearance of the area contrary to CS Policies DS1 and DS3 and Policy ANDP4 of the Addingham Neighbourhood Plan which seek to ensure good quality design.

Highway Safety

19. The appeal site and several other dwellings are accessed off a narrow driveway that joins The Street, a partially unadopted highway forming a private drive and which currently serves significantly more dwellings than the 5 that are recommended.

20. Information, in the form of a swept path analysis, has not been submitted demonstrating that the turning of a refuse vehicle can be accommodated. Nonetheless, on my site visit I witnessed a waste vehicle successfully turning at the entrance to Street House Farm and The Arches, albeit having to undertake several manoeuvres. Moreover, I note that the proposal shows the removal of part of a low stone wall adjoining the access point the Street House Farm, which would slightly increase the turning area. Although this does not bring the access to adoptable standards in respect of its width it would make the turning manoeuvres a little easier.
21. Whilst the introduction of an additional dwelling would not increase the number of waste collections, there would be an increase in the number of deliveries, for example by couriers or supermarkets. However, I do not consider that the number of additional traffic movements associated with one additional dwelling would result in a marked difference to the extent that it would cause an unacceptable risk to highway safety.
22. I find, therefore, that the proposal would not represent a significant risk to highway safety having regard to the width of the access and the adequacy of provision for turning by service, delivery and refuse vehicles. As such, I find no conflict with CS Policies DS4 and DS5.

Conclusion

23. Whilst I have found that the proposal would not represent a significant risk to highway safety this does not outweigh the harm to the setting of listed buildings and the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
24. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR