



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2023

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/23/3327654

4 Wood Nook, Whalley Lane, Denholme, Bradford BD13 4LH

- 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 Matos against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01130/HOU, dated 29 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 23 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage and workshop.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a detached garage and workshop at 4 Wood Nook, Whalley Lane, Bradford BD13 4LH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/01130/HOU, dated 29 March 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 9827/02; 98272/03.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building to which it relates.

Main Issues

2. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposal amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end-of-terrace house located in the open countryside, and is identified as being within the Green Belt. The proposal is for a detached outbuilding of split-level design. The materials would be stone and slate to match the existing terrace and other neighbouring outbuildings.
4. Paragraph 149 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt, unless it falls within a number of listed exceptions. One of these exceptions is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. This was the basis on which the Council assessed the proposal, and so shall I.
5. The Framework does not define what constitutes 'disproportionate'. However, the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sets out

that extensions in the Green Belt which result in an addition of over 30% of the original cubic volume are likely to be considered disproportionate.

6. It has not been disputed that the proposal would exceed the 30% threshold referred to in the SPD, albeit no specific details have been provided. Nevertheless, the SPD is guidance, and the word 'likely' implies that exceedances of the threshold are not automatically disproportionate. When determining whether a proposal would be a disproportionate addition, it is important to also consider the particular nature of the proposal and its specific site context. Ultimately, this will be a matter of planning judgement for the decision maker.
7. In this case, the proposal would be viewed in the context of the much larger terraced building to which the appeal property belongs. It is also significant that the proposal would be built partially below the ground, with the two-storey elevation located at the rear where the topography and dense woodland vegetation to the north would completely screen it from view. From the front, and in some more distant views from the south, the proposal would appear as a modest single-storey garage, clearly subservient in size to the row of terraced houses, and comparable to the size and appearance of the neighbouring outbuildings. Indeed, the Council's officer report states that *'from the front elevation the single-storey appearance of the building is subordinate to the parent dwelling and is situated in an appropriate position for a detached garage type of development'*. The use of complementary building materials would further reduce its visual impact, and overall, the development would integrate well with its surroundings.
8. Taking all these factors into account, it is my judgement that the proposal would not be a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. Therefore, despite some conflict with the SPD, the proposal would not amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not conflict with the relevant provisions of the Framework.
9. As the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, it would, by definition, not have an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt or the purposes of including land within it. Nor is there any need to assess whether there are special circumstances to justify the development.

Conditions

10. I have imposed the standard commencement and approved plans conditions for certainty. A condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building is necessary to ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development. No other conditions were suggested by the Council.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR