



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2026

by Laura Bartle BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/25/3374516

Raggalds Farm, Brighouse and Denholme Road, Denholme, Bradford BD13 1NA

- 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 James Price against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01315/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a front infill extension, rear porch and outbuilding conversion with a fenestration and roof change.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The site lies within the Green Belt. The main parties agree that the proposal would not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, with the appellant referring to an exception to such development at paragraph 154(g) of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) specifically in relation to the outbuilding element. Given this, my findings in respect of the main issue in dispute and thus the outcome of the appeal, I see no reason to consider the matter further.
3. The description of the development in the heading is taken from the planning application form. However, the appellants evidence suggests that part of the scheme would include redevelopment rather than conversion of the existing outbuilding. Whether it would entail a conversion or replacement of the outbuilding has no bearing on my assessment of the main issue identified below. Nevertheless, in the interests of certainty, I have based my decision on the proposal including a conversion, as originally specified.
4. Similarly, although the appellant has indicated that the proposed porch would not be implemented if permission were granted, I have determined the appeal on the basis of what was proposed for the application.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The site comprises one half of a subdivided farmhouse, together with a separate outbuilding and an adjacent paddock. It forms part of a late 19th century farmyard,

with modest, functional buildings arranged around a shared yard in a relatively compact cluster.

7. The site occupies an elevated rural position and is set back behind a field that separates it from Brighthouse and Denholme Road, as well as the small cluster of development alongside it. While the site is visible from the road, these views are distant in nature. Shorter-range views are, however, available on the northerly approach along the public footpath that runs from the road to Pit Lane, passing the north-western edge of the farmyard.
8. The dwelling is constructed of coursed natural stone, with a stone slate roof. While variations in tone and coursing indicate incremental changes to the building over time, the consistent use of traditional materials provides the building with a largely coherent character and appearance. Moreover, it overwhelmingly continues to present as a traditional farmhouse and thereby contributes positively to the prevailing rural landscape within which it sits, which is evident from open and spacious recreational playing pitches, expansive agricultural land and dispersed farmsteads in the vicinity.
9. A two-storey gabled rear range off the main part of the building presents to an open garden area. The window openings on this elevation are modest and asymmetrical at both ground and first-floor level. They contrast with those on the rear of the neighbouring property, which form part of a converted barn attached to the adjoining farmhouse. In that case, a catslide roof sits above a large arched window, and the simpler, more utilitarian detailing reflects the building's former agricultural function.
10. The proposed extension would fill much of the recess at the rear of the building, leaving a narrow gap between the proposal and the neighbouring property's ground-floor windows. This would create an awkward and uncomfortable relationship with that neighbouring elevation.
11. Although relatively small scale, the extension's form would consequently appear cramped and visually incongruous when seen in the context of the wider façade. Furthermore, the size and positioning of the proposed fenestration, which would include three unusually small first floor windows, would neither complement nor reflect the existing pattern of openings in the building. Whilst there are three rooflights within the neighbouring roof, the three proposed in the extension would display a tightly compact and therefore unsympathetic arrangement. This would accentuate the discordant appearance of the scheme and would detract from the traditional character and appearance of the host building.
12. On the approach along the access track and from the public footpath, the proposed extension would appear as an incongruous addition that would undermine the traditional characteristics of the farmhouse and the barn conversion. The use of matching materials and the extension's relative scale would not be sufficient to mitigate or outweigh this harm.
13. The proposed porch would be positioned on the opposite side of the dwelling, against the elongated main wing of the building that fronts the yard. Whilst it would be the only projection along the whole of the façade, its small scale, positioning, and simple form and detailing would satisfactorily integrate with the existing elevation. It would therefore be acceptable in respect of its impact on character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area.

14. The existing outbuilding comprises two traditional agricultural elements: a stone store with a dual-pitched roof and an adjoining dry-stone stable with a lean-to roof. Together, these components form a coherent and functional pair that makes a positive contribution to the rural character and appearance of the farmyard. Their simple massing, modest roof forms, and utilitarian openings are characteristic of outbuildings in the locality and are read clearly as agricultural structures rather than domestic ones.
15. Although the proposal would retain the existing building footprint, it would increase the overall volume by introducing a single continuous pitched roof across the full length of the structure. This change would fundamentally alter the building's profile on all elevations. The resulting roof form would have a unified, more domestic-looking roofscape, giving the impression of a single, larger dwelling-type building.
16. The proposed fenestration and elevation treatment would add further domestic features that are not presently evident. The scale, proportions and arrangement of the new openings, combined with the simplified continuous roof, would give the building a contemporary residential character. Even with the use of sympathetic materials, the cumulative effect of the increased volume, altered roof form and domestic-scaled glazing would be at odds with the prevailing character of outbuildings within the immediate farmyard and the wider rural area.
17. Furthermore, the proposed outbuilding would erode the functional character of the farmyard by introducing a form and elevation treatment that reads as residential rather than agricultural. This harm would be apparent in views within the yard and in the immediate surroundings where the outbuilding contributes to the overall farmyard composition.
18. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would be contrary to Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford Core Strategy insofar as they require development to achieve good design and high-quality places, contribute to the character of the area and retain and integrate built features which could contribute to creating a distinctive identity.

Other Matters

19. I note the appellant's concerns regarding the Council's handling of the application, but this is not a matter to be addressed as part of this appeal. For the avoidance of doubt, I have assessed the proposal based on the information before me.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above and taking into account the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Laura Barte

INSPECTOR