



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2025

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/25/3369277

Bullcliff Farm Cottage, Denby Dale Road, Bretton, Wakefield WF4 4JN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs S Wilkes against the decision of Wakefield Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00413/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of an outbuilding and construction of cedar-clad extension to replace the existing pergola to form an annex and garden room to the main dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of an outbuilding and construction of cedar-clad extension to replace the existing pergola to form an annex and garden room to the main dwelling house at Bullcliff Farm Cottage, Denby Dale Road, Bretton, Wakefield in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 25/00413/FUL and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted relates to the following approved plans: 2506-D-20-001, 003B and 005B.
 - 2) The barn doors shall be installed within 12 months of this decision and retained thereafter.
 - 3) Notwithstanding the details on 2506-D-20-005B with regard to materials, the cedar cladding shall remain unstained.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are whether the proposal would amount to inappropriate development within the Green Belt; whether there would be any other harm to the Green Belt; whether it would result in harm to the setting of heritage assets; and whether the 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 necessary to justify the development.

Reasons

3. The proposal relates to works that have already been carried out to convert an existing outbuilding into living accommodation and to extend it to provide a garden room.

Whether inappropriate development within the Green Belt

4. The appellants suggests that rather than being considered as an extension to the outbuilding, the proposal should be considered as an extension to the house. The house has a limited rear garden area and the outbuilding forms one boundary to it. The outbuilding is located in close proximity to the main element of the dwelling and is within the same use. It is connected to it by a short stretch of wall which results in a greater perceived inter-relationship and intimacy. Reference has been made to the High Court Judgement of *Warwick DC v SSLUHC* [2022] EWHC 2145 (Admin). Given the particular circumstances of this case, I accept the appellants' view that the works should be considered as an extension to the house overall, rather than an extension to the outbuilding for Green Belt purposes.
5. Based on the above, the extension proposed would result in only a very small increase in the scale of buildings overall, calculated by the appellants to be a 7% volume increase. On this basis, the proposed extension would not constitute a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. The proposal would not therefore represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Policy LP62(2)(a) of the Local Plan (2024)(LP) accepts limited, small-scale development in the Green Belt including extensions and alterations that are not disproportionate over and above the size of the existing building(s) when originally constructed. There would therefore be no conflict with this policy or the similar requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. As the proposal would not represent inappropriate development, openness does not need to be considered further and very special circumstances are not needed to justify the development.
6. The council has sought to compare the size of the extension to that of the out building whilst the appellants have also sought to have the proposal assessed on the basis of it being the redevelopment of previously developed land. Whilst I have had regard to both approaches, as the proposal satisfies the development plan and Framework policies as an extension to the main building, these matters do not need to be considered further.

Whether there would be harm to the setting of heritage assets

7. The brick outbuilding is a prominent feature at the entrance to this range of historic farm buildings. The gable treatment has been changed with the former outbuilding opening having been replaced by black timber panelling with matching coloured window frames above. The plans indicate that this would be altered with timber doors, one fixed and one openable to reveal a glazed panel. This would result in an improvement over the current arrangement.
8. The cedar clad extension is set behind a stone wall and extends towards the trunk of a large tree. The dark fascia reduces the prominence of the low roof and the cladding sits comfortably between the brick work of the outbuilding and the tree. The differing form and materials of the extension, together with its limited size and height, ensure that it sits unobtrusively alongside the outbuilding. The materials and detailing of the addition represent good design in this context and result in a suitable juxtaposition, retaining the original character of the outbuilding. The plans indicate that the cladding would be stained black which would be a less satisfactory

treatment. As it has been suggested that the timber would remain untreated, this is a matter that can be controlled by a condition.

9. There are two grade II listed converted barns within the complex. The nearest can be viewed in association with this outbuilding when arriving at this site. The council have not raised a concern with regard to this proposal harming the setting of that building. I am mindful of the legislative duty set out in Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as revised, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. However, I agree with the council's assessment. The proposal would similarly have no impact on the setting of the second listed barn conversion further into the complex.
10. The council consider that the remaining buildings in the complex are of local interest and should be considered as non-designated heritage assets. I am not persuaded that the extension to this outbuilding results in any harm to the setting of the associated cottage or the adjoining farm house. I am mindful also that the council accepted significant changes to the nearest part of the cottage as part of a 2021 permission that has not been implemented and now appears to have expired. The Framework, with regard to non-designated heritage assets, requires that a balanced judgement be made having regard to the scale of any harm or loss to the significance of the heritage asset. As I am not satisfied that the proposal results in any harm or loss to the significance of these heritage assets, I find no conflict with the requirements of the Framework.
11. Given the above and as I find the design to be of a high standard in this particular context, I do not find conflict with the design or heritage requirements of LP policies SP23, LP56, LP63, LP64 or LP65; or the sections of the Residential Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document 2018 relating to outbuildings, Green Belt or buildings of local interest.

Conclusions

12. In conclusion, the proposed extension is well designed and does not result in harm to the character or appearance of the area or the setting of these historic buildings. It does not represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt. As there are no other matters that weigh significantly against the proposal, I allow the appeal.
13. As the development has been carried out, a commencement condition is not necessary. I have referred to the details of the submitted plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. The only discrepancy between the built form and the submitted plans relates to the rear gable door treatments and I have required that these be installed within 12 months as the changes are necessary to make the proposal acceptable. The plans suggest that the cedar cladding be stained black whilst the appellants have suggested it should be retained in a natural untreated form. I have required that it remain untreated for the avoidance of doubt.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR