
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2025

by **S Hunt BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/Y/24/3356638

2 Woodhouse Cliff, Leeds LS6 2HF

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Martin Langfield against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/04240/LI.
 - The works proposed are alterations to hopper and downpipes at front of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for alterations to hopper and downpipes at front of property at 2 Woodhouse Cliff, Leeds LS6 2HF in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 24/04240/LI.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of works in the banner heading above is the one used by the Council, which is more concise version of that on the application form.
3. The works have been carried out and the downpipe is in place.
4. As the appeal relates to a listed building and is in a conservation area (CA) I have had special regard to sections (s) 16(2), 66(1) and 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposed works would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building.

Reasons

6. The property which relates to this appeal at 2 Woodhouse Cliff is a three storey (with basement) mid-terraced town house at the junction of Woodhouse Cliff and Cliff Road. The building is listed Grade II as a pair with 1 Woodhouse Cliff (ref. 1255684). The listing notes the pair dates from the early 19th century. They are constructed from ashlar stone under a slate roof, with multi-paned sash windows. They form part of a terrace with 3 and 4 Woodhouse Cliff, also Grade II listed, with similar features albeit slightly taller in height at eaves level.

7. The terrace is prominently situated within the Headingley Hill and Hyde Park and Woodhouse Moor CA, opposite a wooded area of open space forming part of the wider Woodhouse Moor, an urban park in a suburban area of Leeds developed from the 1800s. The CA appraisal (2012) notes that the stone villas on Woodhouse Cliff formed some of the first development in the area. The special character of the CA reflects its original status as the premier suburb of Leeds.
8. The special interest of the building insofar as it relates to this appeal is primarily related to its age, use of materials and status in the initial development of the suburb. The building positively contributes to both the character and appearance of the CA.
9. The photographs supplied with the evidence indicate that there was previously a black coloured plastic drainpipe leading from the timber gutter and slightly offset from the adjoining property at no. 3. The photograph shows that there was previously a hopper in place part way down the drainpipe, broadly in line with the second floor windows and also taking rainwater from a shorter downpipe leading from the gutter at no. 3.
10. The replacement downpipe, in the same location as the previous, is of more historically appropriate cast iron material (painted black) and as such I consider the impact of the works on the significance of the listed building to be positive. Consequently, the special interest of the listed building is preserved. It follows that the works also preserve the character or appearance of the CA.
11. The Council contends that the removal of the hopper results in harm to the significance of the listed building and its neighbour at no. 3, due to the potential damage to the stonework and the overflow of water resulting in staining.
12. From the supplied photographs, and my observations on site, the discoloured stonework is common to all of the buildings within the terrace, probably as a result of weathering and pollution over a long period of time. There is clearly a band of lighter stonework which could have been 'washed' by water overflow, as it starts at broadly the same location as the former hopper. Nonetheless, this is not the only area of the terrace where this change in colour occurs. Any additional erosion or discolouration of stonework is not apparent from the 'before and after' photographs, nor from my observations on site. It is difficult to attribute any such effects from the loss of the hopper alone, both to the existing building and its neighbour.
13. The evidence indicates that the downpipe from no.3 leading to the former hopper was removed in the relatively recent past. A small gap in the timber fascia can be observed, and there is some damage to the stonework where the hopper was situated. This damage appears to be primarily to the adjoining property. Whilst it is regrettable that the rainwater goods to no.3 have not been replaced, this is outside of the control of the appellant. The neighbouring drainage arrangements and whether it results in additional flow to the appeal property represent a civil matter outside of the remit of this appeal.
14. Whilst the appellant takes the view that each property in the terrace would originally have had a single downpipe, without historic photographs I am unable to ascertain this.

15. From the supplied photograph, the hopper did not have any special architectural or historic merit, and I am content that it made a neutral contribution to the significance of the listed building. I also note that there is no hopper to the downpipe at no.1. Putting aside any drainage considerations, its removal preserves the special interest of the listed building, the setting of its neighbours and the character or appearance of the CA.
16. Given the above I conclude that, on balance, the proposal would preserve the special historic and architectural interest of the Grade II listed building and the character and appearance of the CA. This would satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 210 of the NPPF and development plan policies insofar as relevant.
17. No conditions are necessary given that the works are in place, which do not result in any harm that might be overcome by conditions.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

Susan Hunt

INSPECTOR