
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2023

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3308621

7 Poplar Square, Stanningley, Pudsey, Leeds LS28 5AW

- 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 Miss Dorothea Thirkill-Hobson against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03123/FU, dated 3 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is changing windows to French doors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposal relates to a back-to-back dwelling, which sits within a well-established terrace of stone construction within the Conservation Area, within which the property forms a positive building¹.
4. This part of the Conservation Area comprises largely of traditional stone-built 19th century terraces which have an established and attractive appearance. The form, scale, materials and detailing of these buildings are defining features of its character and appearance.
5. Despite some modern alterations including varying window materials/designs and satellite dishes, the terraces which form Poplar Square retain an overall cohesive appearance. This includes the size and proportion of the main front window openings within the host terrace.
6. The extension of the window opening downwards and the inclusion of patio glazed double doors would be an unfamiliar form of development which would disrupt and detract from the otherwise broadly cohesive appearance of the terrace.
7. The proposal would subsequently detract from the heritage significance of the Conservation Area which lies in part with the form, scale, materials and detailing of the buildings.

¹ Farsley Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan May 2010 P.17.

8. The harm to the significance of the Conservation Area would be less than substantial. Paragraph 202 of the Framework² requires such harm to be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal.
9. The benefits of the proposal are likely to be limited to an enlarged window at the appeal property which would offer direct access to the garden and which could provide additional light to the room.
10. Whilst additional light would be considered beneficial by the occupant on this north facing dwelling, given that the additional glazing would be at a very low level there is nothing within the evidence to indicate any increase in light would be of any significant substance. It is likely that there could be other means by which any damp problem could be remedied.
11. The public benefits would be limited in scope being restricted to the current and future 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 benefits are not sufficient to outweigh this harm.
12. The proposal would fail to accord with Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds Core Strategy (2019) (CS) and saved Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006). Amongst other things, these policies require proposals of good design, where the historic environment, including historic buildings and townscapes will be conserved and enhanced.

Conclusion

13. 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

² National Planning Policy Framework 2021.