
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2019 by C McDonagh BA (Hons), MA

by V Lucas LLB (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/19/3237875

Redcot Nurses Home, Newall Mount, Otley, LS21 2DY

- 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 James Smith against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03658/FU, dated 12 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension / internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the Otley Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises an end-terrace, red-brick and render Edwardian style dwelling. To the rear is a garden area, a low boundary wall and a taller fence separate the side of the property from the Billams Hill Road. Newall Mount provides access to off-street parking for houses on this terrace and other properties further down. The site is located within the Otley Conservation Area.
5. The proposal entails the erection of a single-storey extension to the rear elevation of the dwelling. The design indicates a flat roof with large windows and doors on two sides and smaller windows facing the road. The proposal would extend roughly half way across the width of the rear elevation, and a patio area is also included to the side of the new structure, with steps down to the garden.
6. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.

7. The Otley Conservation Area appraisal identifies the appeal site as within Area 2 (Riverside). The Riverside is identified as one of Otley's greatest assets, with Newall Mount described as an attractive residential terrace which, alongside other examples in the area, frames this space. I noted on the site visit the host property has a commanding presence in the immediate area, making a positive contribution to the significance of the CA.
8. Further regard is had to the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) which seeks to ensure extensions, additions and alterations respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.
9. While I appreciate the CA appraisal does not direct design or preclude extensions, and that nuances in the nearby vernacular have occurred over time, the proposal includes large windows and doors that would not be in keeping with the style of these features on the host property, which is highlighted as an 'other positive building' in the CA appraisal. It therefore makes an important contribution to this part of the CA and the design of a proposal should be complementary to the host property. It would also be contrary to the SPD, which states all new windows and doors should respect the character and appearance of the original house.
10. Moreover, the boxy form of the proposed extension, while simple in form, would obscure and thereby detract from the vertical proportions and prominence of the rear elevation of Redcot, diminishing its significance in this framing section of the Riverside area. As such, the extension would not sit comfortably in this location and would be read as an unsympathetic addition to the host property, lacking a sense of cohesion. While the house and plot are large, it is not the scale of the extension that would be of concern; rather its design which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and this part of the CA.
11. While I acknowledge existing trees do afford some screening to the rear garden area at present, I noted on the site visit the rear elevation of the host property was highly visible from the junction of Billams Hill and Farnley Lane and when travelling past the dwelling up Billams Hill from the town centre. This is irrespective of whether the rear constitutes the principle elevation or not. I note the suggestion to add more trees to increase screening. However, this would take time to mature and would not be permanent. Therefore, I am not convinced this would alleviate the harm I have identified.
12. For these reasons the proposal would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the Otley Conservation Area and as such would be contrary to the requirements of the Act.
13. The development would affect only part of the CA and therefore in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the harm caused to its significance would be less than substantial. The approach in paragraph 196 of the Framework is that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
14. There are no public benefits forwarded by the appellant which would weigh in favour of the proposal. As such, I have nothing to indicate the proposal would

outweigh the harm I have identified; harm which, given the requirements of the Act and guidance in Paragraph 193 of the Framework, carries great weight.

15. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. It would therefore conflict with policies P10, P11 and P12 of the Leeds Core Strategy (CS), policy BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (UDPR), and the SPD. Collectively these seek to ensure development respects and enhances existing streets and buildings, conserves heritage assets and protects the quality and character of townscapes. The proposal would also conflict with paragraph 196 of the Framework.

Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

V Lucas

INSPECTOR