
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025

by **Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/25/3369541

14 Church Garth, Pool in Wharfedale, Otley, Leeds LS21 1QU

- 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 Ms Maxine Laverick against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00581/FU.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Change to original frames design for all windows to enable more light to enter house (less frame and more pane), and change from Rosewood outside frame colour to Chartwell Green. Change from Rosewood front door to a new door in Chartwell Green, with a change in window design'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development above has been taken from the application form. The Council's decision notice describes the development as 'change of window frames', which does not include all the elements of the proposal. As the appeal form confirms that the description of development on the application form is still correct, in the interest of precision, I have considered the proposal accordingly.
3. The appellant has stated, at the appeal stage, that the proposal is now to use the same colour frames as the existing properties, rather than changing the frames colour to green as originally applied for at the application stage. As the appeal's process should not be used to evolve a scheme, and in the interests of fairness and precision, I have considered the appeal proposal based on the details that were before the Council at the time of its decision, and on which third parties have been consulted on.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Pool-in-Wharfedale Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a terraced dwelling situated within a residential cul-de-sac in the CA. The significance of the CA, in the context of this appeal, is primarily derived from the historic layout of the residential development and the cohesive architectural character shared by groups of buildings within it. The appeal property forms part of an L-shaped terrace that exhibits consistent design features, notably the style and colour of the window frames and doors. This uniformity in

fenestration and detailing is a defining characteristic of the group and makes a positive contribution to the overall character and appearance of the CA.

6. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. National policy on heritage assets is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). At paragraph 202 it states that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.
7. The windows and door are key elements of the appeal dwelling's character, particularly given its position within a cohesive terrace and its prominence in the street scene. The proposed replacement windows would omit the original grid-like design with vertical and horizontal muntins, which is a defining feature of the existing fenestration. In addition, the proposed green frames and door would sharply contrast with the established brown colour scheme. This combined change in design and colour would disrupt the uniformity of detailing that characterises the cul-de-sac, undermining the visual harmony of the terrace. Consequently, given the dwelling's prominence and its role in maintaining the integrity of the group, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the CA.
8. My attention has been drawn to the window design of the neighbouring property No 12 Church Garth. During my site visit, I observed that the windows on its front elevation do not incorporate the grid-like pattern of vertical and horizontal muntins found in the original design of the terrace. However, the appeal proposal is not directly comparable to that property, as it involves not only a change in design but also a significant alteration in colour. In any event, I have assessed the proposal on its own merits, taking into account its relationship with the wider terrace and the overall character of the group of dwellings.
9. Given the scale of the proposal and the extent of the conservation area, harm to the significance of the CA would be low within the less than substantial category. Due to the impact of the proposal on the CA, the identified harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal in accordance with paragraph 215 of the Framework.
10. The appellant asserts that the proposed change of style for the window frames would allow more light into the appeal dwelling. Be that as it may, this would be a private benefit. No public benefits have been explicitly drawn to my attention. As such, the identified harm is not outweighed by public benefits. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with the aims and objectives of the Framework which seek to sustain and enhance the significance of the heritage assets.
11. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Thus, it would not meet the statutory requirements of the Act. Furthermore, the development would be contrary to the aims of Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds Core Strategy, which collectively require, amongst other things, the design of the development to be appropriate to its context and respect the character and quality of surrounding buildings, including heritage assets. The proposal would also conflict with the aims of the Framework, as set out above.
12. Policy BD5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review Volume 2: Appendices 2006 concerns new buildings and requires consideration to be given to both their

own amenity and that of their surroundings. As such, it is not directly relevant to the appeal proposal.

Other Matters

13. I have had regard to the support expressed by third parties, as outlined within the appellant's evidence. However, this does not alter my findings above.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

INSPECTOR