



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025 by Sara Manson DipTP

### Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 August 2025

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3362966

#### 15 Woodway Drive, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 4HZ

- 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 Mrs T Riding against the decision of Leeds City Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/07216/FU.
  - The development proposed is a loft conversion with rear dormer window.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. Works have been carried out but not completed. I have referred to them accordingly. French doors have been installed, but do not form part of the proposals. I have determined the appeal based on the submitted plans. The main issue for which is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Horsforth Cragg Hill and Woodside Conservation Area (CA).

### Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a modest, relatively modern semi-detached bungalow, situated off a small cul-de-sac. It has been extended to the rear. Due to the rising gradient, the rear of the site is visible from the public highway and rear gardens of neighbouring properties. The area comprises similar dwellings set back from the highway with small front and rear gardens which, by virtue of limited visible alterations, unobtrusive and proportionate low, linear roofscapes, lend a pleasant consistency and originality to the street which contributes positively to the significance of the CA.
5. Although slightly set down from the ridge, the dormer window would occupy almost the entire width of the roof slope. It would not be set up from the eaves, resulting in an overly large, boxy and dominant addition which would erode the quality in the originality of the roof's shape, appearing significantly disproportionate than that of its adjoining neighbour, creating an incongruous addition that would overwhelm and unbalance the simple design of this pair of semi-detached properties. I appreciate

that the French doors would be removed, and the extension would be finished in appropriate materials to the dwelling. These elements would not however sufficiently reduce the harm caused by the development's bulk and prominence.

6. There are other examples of rear dormer extensions in the area. They are of varying age, design and size. Whilst they form part of the character of the area, they would not justify one of the size and design on the dwelling subject of the appeal scheme for the reasons I have set out.
7. As a result of the above therefore, the proposals would harm the significance of the CA which would neither preserve nor enhance its character or appearance. Given its localised effect, the harm would be less than substantial for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Nevertheless, it is a matter of considerable weight and importance. In such circumstances, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
8. It would increase living accommodation for the existing occupiers and although there would be some economic public benefit, during construction, this would be time limited in its effect. Ultimately, the mainstay of the benefits would be private. Therefore, the public benefits in this instance carry only very limited weight that would, by definition, be insufficient to outweigh the harm to the CA.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would conflict with Policies P10 and P11 of the Core Strategy Selective Review Leeds Local Plan (2019), Policies BD6, GP5 and N19 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review) (2006) and guidance contained in the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012), Horsforth Design Statement Supplementary Planning Document (2010) and the Framework. Together, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and are acceptable for the historic environment.

### **Other Matter**

10. In 3341995, the Inspector observed that the dormer would cover around half the roof slope only. Therefore, significantly smaller and very different in terms of visual prominence than the proposals before me. My findings do not therefore change.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

11. The proposals would conflict with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Sara Manson*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*John Morrison*

INSPECTOR