
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2024

by T Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3341995

15 Woodway Drive, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 4HZ

- 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 Andrew Hargreaves against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/07382/FU, dated 6 December 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2024.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with rear dormer including window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for loft conversion with rear dormer including window at 15 Woodway Drive, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 4HZ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/07382/FU dated 6 December 2023 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan & Drawing 01 Rev A.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my site visit a dormer window appeared to have been partly constructed at the property, although that dormer window was not that which is the subject of this appeal which relates to a smaller dormer window covering less of the width of the property. I have determined the appeal based on the dormer window as detailed on the drawings relevant to this proposal rather than what is in place at the site.
3. The description of the proposal differs from the application form to the decision notice. The former references a french door whilst the latter references a Juliet balcony. The plans do not appear to show either feature on the dormer and I have therefore omitted this and wording that is not a description of development from the description.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Horsforth Cragg Hill and Woodside Conservation Area (The Conservation Area).

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a modern semi-detached bungalow set on a cul-de-sac amongst other similar modern properties within a predominantly residential area. The Conservation Area Appraisal¹ identifies the high density cul-de-sac developments as a negative characteristic of this part of the Conservation Area. The appeal property is not identified as a positive building within the Conservation Area. Despite this, the area has significance via its suburban appearance including a palette of neutral materials which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The rear dormer window would not be set up from the eaves and the proportions and alignment of the window would not align with the window below. However, it would not be overly large or dominant and would cover around half the roof slope only. It would be set well in from one side of the dwelling and be set slightly below the ridgeline. It would also be clad in concrete tiles to match the existing roof. It would not significantly imbalance the appearance of the property.
7. Nonetheless there would be conflict with SPD² guidance in relation to dormer windows as identified by the Council. However, there are a significant number of large and bulky dormer windows in the area of varying forms, detailing, window design and age, such that they form part of the established character and appearance of this particular area regardless of when they were constructed or which guidance was in place at the time.
8. Therefore, taking account of the characteristics of this particular area, the proposal would not ultimately undermine the significance of this part of the Conservation area and there would be no harm to its character or appearance.
9. The proposal would not therefore conflict with policies P10 and P11 of the Core Strategy Selective Review (2019) which amongst other things require that development respects the character and quality of an area and at a minimum preserves the historic environment. Further, the proposal would not conflict with Policies GP5, BD6 and N19 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) which amongst other things require resolution on design issues and that alterations and extensions respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building. Extensions should preserve the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.
10. The proposal would not conflict with Policy HDG1 of the SPD which requires that extensions, additions and alterations respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and locality.

¹ Horsforth Cragg Hill and Woodside Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan – August 2011 – Leeds City Council.

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

Conditions

11. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three year time limit. It is necessary that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. It is also necessary that the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted should match those used in the existing building.

Conclusion

12. I have identified some conflict with the SPG, but considerations indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

T Burnham

INSPECTOR