



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2019

by Adrian Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/19/3227630

21 Outwood Walk, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 4JG

- 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 Ms H Worley against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 18/07571/FU, dated 6 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 28 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and addition of pitched roof to existing front dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the appeal form and decision notice because it includes reference to the dormer window, which is part of the proposal but was not mentioned in the description on the application form.
3. The Council has clarified that the site lies adjacent to the Horsforth Cragg Hill and Woodside Conservation Area (CA) rather than being within the Horsforth Conservation Area as stated in the delegated report. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. Outwood Walk is a steeply rising cul de sac lined predominantly by two storey, semi-detached houses, except for Nos 14 and 16, which are detached. It is bordered to the north by Little Hawksworth Wood, which forms the boundary of the CA. The main body of the CA lies further to the north and at a much higher elevation above Outwood Walk. A public footpath passes through the woodland linking Outwood Walk to Outwood Lane.
6. The appeal property is located at the end of the street, adjacent to Little Hawksworth Wood. Despite some variation in the appearance of the houses along the street, and some minor porch, side and rear extensions, the symmetry between the individual pairs of semi-detached houses, including the appeal property, is a feature of the street as a whole. Symmetry is particularly evident in the appeal property, which along with its adjoining neighbour No 19,

has distinctive side-by-side central front gables and dormer windows. The infilled porch area of No 19 does not detract from the overall symmetry of the pair.

7. The Leeds City Council Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document April 2012 (SPD) advises that extensions should, in most cases, be subordinate additions, and any extensions which harm the character and appearance of the main dwelling will be resisted. While the Council acknowledge that the SPD is only a guide it is nevertheless consistent with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and I therefore give it considerable weight in my decision.
8. From the information before me it appears that some design discussions took place with the Council. However, I do not consider that the lower ridge height of the new front gable would on its own result in the proposal appearing subordinate when viewed from the street. In this respect, the lack of subordination in the main roof, along with the visually-competing second gable with bay window, and pitched roof dormer, would in combination significantly unbalance the appearance of the semi-detached pairing and remove the sense of symmetry. This would cause harm to the character and appearance of the building. Notwithstanding the end-of-street location, this harmful effect would still be evident from part of the street, the properties opposite and to users of the public footpath.
9. I note that there has been a letter of support in favour of improving a derelict house, but improvement works were already being carried out when I visited the site, including new windows, and I did not regard the condition of the property as derelict. Therefore, I give this matter only limited weight in my decision. Furthermore, the provision of additional bed space and open plan modernisation of the property are not considerations that justify the harm that would be caused by the proposed development.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the building and its immediate surroundings. In that regard, the proposal would not accord with saved Policy BD6 (alterations and extensions) of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006 (UDP) and HDG1 (design and appearance) of the SPD, which require extensions to among other things, respect the scale and form of the original building.

Other Considerations

11. Notwithstanding my conclusions above, I am satisfied that given the very different characters of the residential street and adjacent woodland, combined with the topography, there would be no harmful effect on any views into, or from within the adjacent CA and as such, its character and appearance would be preserved. Accordingly, there is no conflict in these respects with Policy P11 (conservation) of the Leeds Core Strategy and saved UDP Policy N19 (conservation areas new building), which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment of Leeds and ensure new development both within or adjacent to a conservation area preserves or enhances its character or appearance. There would also be no conflict with the aims of the Framework in these respects. This does not however alter my findings on the main issue.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Adrian Caines

INSPECTOR