



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2026

by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3375790

13 Princess Road, Ilkley, West Yorkshire LS29 9NP

- 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 Peter Williams against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application ref is 25/02111/HOU.
 - The development proposed is: detached outbuilding and covered garden seat to front of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During my site visit I noted that the development had appeared to have commenced with the shed being in situ but the garden seat absent. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area including the Ilkley Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within the Ilkley Conservation Area (the CA) wherein I have a statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.
5. The Ilkley Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) describes the CA as being formed of elements from various stages in its history and development. It goes on to define six character zones which form the CA, exuding their own unique character. The appeal site is located within the residential expansion zone, comprising late nineteenth century character of larger family sized housing. As such, the significance of the CA is derived from its historic layout and building types.
6. The properties along Princess Road are large, detached dwellings of a similar material palette, set back from the highway. The front elevations of these dwellings form the primary building line with few instances of out buildings beyond this point. The large open front gardens contribute to spaciousness of the area and dominance of the dwellings within the street scene, and therefore their contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.

7. The garden shed, by virtue of its elevated position, appears prominent within the street scene. Its projection beyond the front elevation of the host dwelling appears discordant with the existing front building line formed by these properties, with the timber walls and flat roof further enhancing its discordance with the existing consistent material palette. Whilst not elevated, the covered garden seat would be located close to the appeal site boundary and highway appearing notable when approaching from the south-east. Although modest in size, both of these structures would appear obtrusive within the context of the otherwise open front garden areas. As such, they would disrupt the historic layout with the dwellings establishing the forward line of development, harming the character of the area and the significance of the CA.
8. The use of a pitched slate roof for the garden seat would do little to overcome the structure's discordance with the established pattern of development. Vegetation within the site and boundary treatment would add limited screening of the development from the street scene, particularly the elevated garden shed.
9. Given the scale of the proposal within the context of the CA as a whole, I consider the harm to its significance to be on the lower end of less than substantial. Nevertheless, Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) directs when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of the level of harm.
10. Paragraph 215 of the Framework states that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
11. There would be some public benefit from the local economic contribution during the construction period of the garden seat. Nonetheless, given the scale of the development this would be limited and not outweigh the harm to the significance of the CA as a heritage asset.
12. For the above reasons, I conclude the appeal development fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. As such, the development conflicts with the relevant provisions of Policies DS1, DS3, and EN3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017), Policy INDP5 of the Ilkley Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020-2030 (2022), and the National Planning Policy Framework. When read together these require development to be appropriate in their context in terms of layout, responding to and reinforcing their character, and respect and reinforce the distinctive character of Conservation Areas.

Other Matters

13. The appellant references a small structure previously occupying the same part of the site as the garden seat, however at the time of my visit no such structure was present. Further, I cannot be sure the alleged structure benefited from planning permission, or that the considerations were the same as for the appeal before me. As such, this carries limited weight in my decision which does not outweigh the above identified harm.
14. The appellant references two appeals for outbuildings to the front and side of dwellings. These appeals are within different local planning authority areas and not

within Conservation Areas where the absence of development within the front garden contributes to the historic significance of the heritage asset. Therefore, I do not consider either of these appeals comparable to the one before me.

15. Whilst the proposal would not affect any listed buildings, living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, or access and parking, these are neutral factors and do not weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

INSPECTOR