



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2024

by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/23/3335049

24 Hainworth, Keighley, Bradford BD21 5QH

- 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 Watson against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/02818/HOU, dated 27 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is part single part two storey extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the appeal was submitted, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published. The main parties were given the opportunity to comment on any relevant implications for the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the Framework and any relevant development plan policies.
 - The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt.
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, having regard to whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hainworth Conservation Area (CA).
 - Whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development

4. Paragraph 154 of the Framework states that new buildings are inappropriate in the Green Belt unless they fall within the given list of exceptions. Under section c) of that paragraph an extension to a building will not be inappropriate provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above

the size of the original building. The Framework does not specify what might be considered a disproportionate addition but defines original building as the building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally.

5. The Council's Householder: Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) states that if a dwelling is within the Green Belt, extensions should not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the dwelling as originally built or as existed on 1 July 1948. Where proposals result in an addition of over 30% of the original cubic volume, they are likely to be considered disproportionate.
6. The dwelling has previously been extended to the rear and side. The side extension was constructed to form the garage in around 2002, but there is no planning history for the rear extension. On my site visit I observed that the rear extension appeared to have been carried out in two stages as the roof forms differ and the utility room is slightly stepped in.
7. The Council state that the proposed addition amounts to an 86% increase in volume when combined with the existing extensions. In contrast, the appellant states the construction method, materials, wall thicknesses and lack of planning history of the rear extensions would suggest that the additions predate 1947. No substantive evidence has been provided to support this assertion or to demonstrate that the development would comply with the SPD.
8. The proposal would add a part-single, part two-storey extension to the rear. Regardless of whether the rear projection should be considered to be original or not, given that the extension would increase the depth of the existing rear projection and introduce a first floor element, the proposal would result in a significant increase in the scale and massing of the dwelling. In addition, the garage extension resulted in a notable increase in the scale and massing of the dwelling. Based on the evidence presented, having regard to the increase in volume, scale and massing, the proposed development, when taken in combination with previous additions, would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
9. Consequently, for the reasons given above, the proposal would not fall under any of the exceptions listed in the Framework. The development would therefore be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to chapter 13 of the Framework and guidance set out in the SPD.

Openness

10. Paragraph 142 of the Framework states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.
11. The proposal would have a spatial impact upon the Green Belt as it would add to the cumulative bulk, scale, and massing of the dwelling, and would result in an increase in built development. In terms of visual impact, the extension would be located to the rear, but it is likely that it would be visible from parts of the track.
12. Consequently, for the reasons given above, the development would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt, albeit to a very limited degree having

regard to its size and location. As such, the proposal would conflict with the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy, as stated in the Framework, to keep land permanently open.

Character and appearance

13. As the proposal relates to a conservation area, I have had special regard to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act). The adjoining barn is identified as a key building within the Hainworth Conservation Area Assessment (2005). Since the publication of that document, the barn has been converted into a dwelling.
14. Much of the CA's distinctive character is derived from the range of 18th and early 19th century buildings. The buildings are in the vernacular style, which is peculiar to this area, constructed of traditional building materials and encompass an organic mixture of building types, orientation, heights, and masses.
15. The host dwelling is a mid/late 19th century farmhouse constructed of stone with a slate roof. No 24 and the attached converted barn form a long laithe and face a track, referred to as Hill Top Lane. The host dwelling makes a positive contribution to the CA as it is reflective of the area.
16. The proposed extension would cover most of the original rear element of the building, and would introduce a single and two storey extension with varying roof heights. The proposed extension would have a significantly greater scale and massing than the existing rear projections.
17. The extension would be staggered and would project further than the existing simply designed rear extensions, and beyond the adjoining converted barn building. Its design (including mix of single and two storey rear projections, as well as varying roof heights and angles) would jar with the traditional linear form of the host property and adjoining building. The proposal would result in a discordant addition which would poorly relate to the simple design of the host dwelling and adjoining converted barn. The extension would fail to complement the design of the original property and would be an unsympathetic addition. Whilst the extension is located to the rear, it is likely that it would be visible from parts of the track. Consequently, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. For these reasons, the development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
18. Paragraph 205 of the Framework advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 206 goes on to advise that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.
19. Given the location of the extension to the rear, existing rear extensions, and the CA contains a mix of buildings, the level of harm would be less than substantial. Nonetheless, mindful of my statutory duties, this is a matter to which I attach considerable importance and weight. Under such circumstances, paragraph 208 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

20. The appellant has not clearly outlined benefits of the proposal, but I acknowledge that there would be some limited public benefits of the scheme. Nonetheless, the benefits are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.
21. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, and in the absence of any defined significant public benefit, I conclude that, on balance, the development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Consequently, the proposal fails to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 208 of the Framework and conflicts with Policies DS1, DS3 and EN3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District: Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) and the SPD. These seek, amongst other things, to ensure development proposals achieve good design which are appropriate to their context and conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Other considerations

22. No other considerations have been advanced in support of the proposal.

Conclusion

23. I have found that the appeal proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. It would also have a very limited impact on the openness of the Green Belt. In addition, it would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, and would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The Framework is clear that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt and that 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
24. The appellant has not put forward any other considerations in support of the scheme. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist. I therefore conclude that the scheme would conflict with the Framework, development plan and the SPD.
25. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other material considerations, the appeal does not succeed.

L Wilson

INSPECTOR