
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2022

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3305834

10 North Broadgate Lane, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 4AB

- 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 and Mrs Patrick & Helen McShee against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02929/FU, dated 22 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has been altered from the application form to the decision notice. That on the application form adequately describes the proposal and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Horsforth Conservation Area (the Conservation Area).

Reasons

4. The proposal relates to a large porch extension that would appear to include the provision of seating and storage space along with a WC.
5. This part of the Conservation Area comprises largely of traditional stone-built 19th century buildings of established and attractive appearance. The form, scale, materials and detailing of these buildings are defining features of its character and appearance.
6. The simple, quaint and slightly off-beat stone built north east facing elevation with its off set window and door openings to one side sits prominently above North Broadgate Lane, making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The porch would form a rather complex looking extension for its intended use, incorporating a gabled feature with circular window emanating from a lean to pitched roof. It would also include roof lights, windows to one side elevation, glazed openings to the other and three evenly spaced windows with cills to the main elevation.

8. The design, which is far too detailed and ordered for such a modest and random elevation would contrast sharply with and subsequently detract from the appearance of the property. The proposal would detract from the heritage significance of the Conservation Area which lies in part with the form, scale, materials and detailing of the buildings.
9. The harm to the significance of the Conservation Area would be less than substantial. Paragraph 196 of the Framework¹ requires such harm to be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal.
10. The benefits of the proposal are likely to be limited to enlarged and improved living space at the appeal property. However, the benefit of improved space would primarily be a personal one for the occupant/s of the dwelling. Given the degree of harm I have found that would arise from the appeal scheme and the statutory protection afforded to Conservation Areas, such benefit is not sufficient to outweigh this harm.
11. The proposal would fail to accord with Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds Core Strategy (2019) (CS) saved Policies GP5, BD6 and N19 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) and Policy BE1 of the Horsforth Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2028. Amongst other things, these policies require proposals of good design, where the historic environment, including historic buildings and townscapes will be conserved and enhanced.
12. The proposal would also conflict with SPD² guidance which at HDG1 requires that all extensions, additions and alterations should respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.

Other Matters

13. I appreciate that there are mixed forms of development in the area which does have variation, although on the whole, simple forms of building dominate. I was able to observe extensions apparently placed on the front elevations of properties to the south east, but these appeared to be simple extensions with a lean to pitched roof and their design is not directly comparable to the porch extension before me. I therefore afford this matter limited weight.
14. I was also able to observe that there are some circular windows within the area. They do form a feature, and whilst their use as a design feature is not questioned, the use of such a feature here contributes to the excessively detailed elevation.

Conclusion

15. There is nothing to indicate that the decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan and I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR

¹ National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

² Leeds City Council Householder Design Guide Leeds Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document April 2012.