



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2025

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3368644

29 Prestwick Close, Otley LS21 3NA

- 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 Calie Cranswick against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application reference is 25/01778/FU.
 - The development proposed is a double gable extension to form loft conversion with new dormer to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double gable extension to form loft conversion with new dormer to rear at 29 Prestwick Close, Otley in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 25/01778/FU, and the plans submitted with it, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing 005 revision C.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance of the area; and the effect on the living conditions of the residents of 27 Prestwick Close with regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a hip to gable extension to the roof of the main area of the house and the existing side extension. It would also result in a dormer window to the rear but this has not been raised as a concern by the council.
4. The immediate area is dominated by houses with hipped roofs. Where the houses are aligned, the hipped roofs help to provide a unified gap between properties that contributes to the spatial characteristics of the area. The hipped form and uniform materials also contribute to the wider character of the area. This property however, extends into a corner whereby it is very closely associated with its neighbour. This ensures that there is little in the way of a perceived gap between the properties.

Their respective forms are also not particularly apparent within the wider street scene given this particular juxtaposition. The vegetation within the communal area to the front of these houses also screens many views of them. Whilst maintaining the original design and form of houses may be of importance in some instances, in this particular case, the gap between the properties has already been eroded and the changed roof form would only marginally change the perceived space between buildings at roof level. The changes proposed would not be prominent and would represent a suitable design solution as the hipped roofs currently make little contribution to the character of the wider area.

5. The proposed changes would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the area. The detailing would represent good quality design that would be appropriate in this particular situation and the materials would continue to reflect those within the wider area. Given the above, the proposal would not be contrary to the design requirements of policy P10 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) (CS) or policy BD6 of the Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) (UDP). Policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD) requires that all extensions respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality, with particular attention being paid to the roof form and roof line. Whilst the departure from the original form of the roof results in some conflict with this requirement, it would not be at odds with the overall design objectives of preventing harm to the character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.
6. The council have also raised concerns with regard to the impact on the outdoor amenity space of the adjacent property, 27 Prestwick Close with regard to outlook and light. The proposal would alter the hip of the existing two storey extension. Aside from this, the two storey side elevation would remain unchanged. Whilst it is already close to the neighbouring rear garden, this high level change would have a relatively indiscernible impact on the outlook from the neighbouring garden and any changes with regard to shading would be even more limited given the aspect of these properties. There would be no conflict with the amenity requirements of CS policy P10, UDP policy GP5 or SPD policy HDG2. There would also be no overall conflict with either the design or amenity requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.
7. As the proposed alterations would have a satisfactory appearance and would not harm the living conditions of the neighbouring residents; and as there are no other matters that weigh significantly against the proposal, I allow the appeal.
8. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and the details of the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition would require that the material to be used would match, to ensure that the development would have a satisfactory appearance.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR