



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 27 May 2025

by Ryan Cowley MPlan (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 July 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/N4720/H/25/3359802

118 Town Street, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 4AH

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Bob Pour, on behalf of Marples, against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/05962/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is replacement of current fascia and sign from wood to aluminium composite panel with acrylic letters.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/N4720/W/25/3359803

118 Town Street, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 4AH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Bob Pour, on behalf of Marples, against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/05621/FU.
 - The development proposed is replacement of front elevation shop windows and door from wood to wood grain effect uPVC double glazed windows and composite wood effect door, introducing a transom at door height rather than the vertical dividing window bar which is currently in situ. Installation of awning above fascia shop sign which will be retractable.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. There are two appeals on this site, one against the refusal of planning permission and the other against the refusal of advertisement consent. They are intrinsically linked due to the nature of the proposals. To avoid repetition, while considering each on its merits, I have dealt with both in a single decision letter.
4. In respect of both appeals, I have used the description of the proposals in their respective application forms, omitting that which is unnecessary to accurately describe the scheme.
5. In respect of Appeal A, the Council has drawn my attention to the policies it considers to be relevant to this appeal and I have taken them into account as material considerations. However, powers under the Regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public

safety, taking account of any material factors. In my determination of Appeal A the Council's policies have not therefore, by themselves, been decisive.

Main Issue

6. The main issue in both appeals is the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance / visual amenity of the appeal site and surrounding area, including the Horsforth Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

7. The appeal site comprises a mid-terrace 2-storey stone building with a ground floor shop unit, located in the central part of the CA. The shop front sits between two similar buildings, all with frontages abutting the footpath on Town Street. It is finished in timber, with traditional detailing, and a modest tilted fascia sign.
8. This area is commercial in nature, with shopfronts lining the length of the street. The commercial frontage varies in both style and quality. It features single and double bay properties, with a multitude of glazing styles. The characterful traditional buildings that line the street are interspersed by more modern structures, some of which are unsympathetic to the historic frontage.
9. There are also examples of uPVC shop fronts in the vicinity that do not positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area, including adjacent to the appeal site. Nevertheless, in so far as it relates to this appeal, the significance of this part of the CA is derived from the traditional commercial character of the street, and the appearance and composition of the historic buildings and shopfronts that frame it.
10. The Horsforth Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan Approved 10 November 2008 (CA Appraisal) recognises that there are few remaining historic shop fronts, though there are some high-quality examples surviving. The CA Appraisal seeks the reinstatement of missing architectural features when possible, and advocates for the maintenance and sympathetic repair of surviving historic features. No 118 is highlighted as a positive structure, and I saw on my site visit that it features a pleasant and well-preserved shopfront, which positively contributes to the prevailing character and appearance of the area.
11. The proposals would replace the existing timber single glazed shopfront and door with a uPVC double glazed window and composite door. It would also replace the existing tilted timber fascia and sign with an aluminium composite panel with acrylic letters, which the plans before me depict as flat to the wall.
12. The Appeal B proposal aims to emulate the timber frames with a black wood grain effect. It also seeks to replicate the small windows above the door, remove the existing vertical bar from the main window and introduce a transom at door height. However, uPVC is different in texture and thickness to wood frames. It is not clear from the plans and details before me that this would convincingly replicate the appearance, proportions and detailing of the existing timber frames.
13. Likewise, the modern materiality of the composite door and aluminium fascia would detract from the traditional features of the shopfront. Moreover, there are no retractable awnings along this row of shops, and they are not a common feature along the street. This would thus be a somewhat incongruous addition that would

further weaken the contribution of the existing shop front to the prevailing character and appearance of the area.

14. The proposals would thus harm the character and appearance of the CA, the preservation or enhancement of which I apportion great weight to. It would therefore not accord with the clear expectations of statute in this respect¹
15. In conclusion, the proposals would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance / visual amenity of the appeal site and surrounding area, including the CA. They would conflict with Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), saved Policies GP5, BC7, BD7 and BD8 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review – 2006) and Policy BE1 of the Horsforth Neighbourhood Plan 2019 - 2028. These policies, among other provisions, seek to ensure alterations to existing buildings are based on a thorough contextual analysis and provide good design appropriate to the location. They also seek to ensure that the historic environment is conserved and enhanced, including the historic streetscape of Town Street, development within conservation areas is normally in traditional local materials, all new shop fronts relate architecturally to the buildings in which they are inserted, and all signs are well designed and carefully related to the character, scale and architectural features of the building on which they are placed.
16. With respect to paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework, less than substantial harm would be caused to the significance of the CA, which is a designated heritage asset. The proposals would provide benefits including improved energy efficiency and an associated reduction in CO2 emissions, better temperature control and enhanced safety and security. However, the extent of such benefits arising from the proposals compared to the existing has not been clearly articulated in the evidence. Moreover, it is not clear that there are no alternative means of providing these benefits, that could avoid harm to the significance of the CA. It has therefore not been demonstrated that there are public benefits sufficient to outweigh the identified harm.

Conclusion

17. The appeal proposals would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance / visual amenity of the area, including the CA. I therefore find that the proposals would be contrary to the development plan taken as a whole, as well as the Framework and the Regulations to control advertisements, for the reasons set out above. The material considerations in this case do not indicate that the proposals should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Consequently, I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

Ryan Cowley

INSPECTOR

¹ Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990