



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2024

**by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 23 February 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3335212**

**18 Victoria Walk, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 4PL**

- 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 Kate Laurence against the decision of Leeds City Council.
  - The application Ref 23/05272/FU, dated 29 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 30 October 2023.
  - The development proposed is a hip to gable loft extension; dormer window to rear with Juliet balcony; new second floor window to side and new roof light to front.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for hip to gable loft extension; dormer window to rear with Juliet balcony; new second floor window to side and new roof light to front, at 18 Victoria Walk, Leeds LS18 4PL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/05272/FU, dated 29 August 2023, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan; J40-64 003.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is one half of a pair of two-storey, semi-detached houses situated in an established residential area containing a mix of house types. Many of the houses have been previously extended, including at roof level.
4. A hip to gable alteration can often unbalance a pair of semi-detached houses. However, in this case the adjoining property, No 20, has already carried out a very similar roof alteration. The proposal would therefore restore the symmetry and balance in this semi-detached pair, leading to an improvement compared to the current situation.
5. I do agree with the Council that the rear dormer would be a bulky, box-like structure that would dominate the rear roof slope. Nevertheless, it would be confined to the rear where the only public views would be glimpsed and in a context of many other similar rear dormers, including at No 20. I am also mindful of the permitted development options that are available to the

property, as demonstrated in the appellant's evidence. As such, whilst there is some conflict with the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) in relation to the size of the dormer, the effect on the street scene and surrounding area would be minimal.

6. I am therefore satisfied that the development could be accommodated at the site without causing harm to the character and appearance of the area. Thus, the proposal complies with the general design requirements of Policies P10 and P12 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (amended 2019); Saved Policies BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds City Council Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006); and the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Other Matters**

7. The Council did not identify any harm to the significance of a Scheduled Ancient Monument located on New Road Side. I see no reason to disagree, and I am satisfied that its setting would be preserved.

### **Conditions**

8. As suggested in the Council's appeal questionnaire, I have imposed the standard time limit and approved plans conditions for certainty. However, a condition relating to external materials is not necessary as these are described on the approved plans.

### **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

*A Caines*

INSPECTOR