



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2024

by C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/24/3343810

31-33 Cardinal Road, Beeston, Leeds LS11 8EY

- 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 Raj and Mrs Hardip Sidhu against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/07081/FU.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to shop.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is one of a pair of brick built semi-detached properties with hipped roof. The ground floor is currently a convenience store and off licence with residential use above. The front elevation is part render and part shop window with signage above. There is a ramp and step access from the main door, which leads to a tarmac open forecourt. The property has a substantial single storey extension to the side and an enclosed amenity area.
4. There are several other retail premises in this location, which have unenclosed forecourt areas. Aside from these units the surrounding area is characterised by terraces or semi-detached properties of similar design, with small front enclosed gardens. Cardinal Road is fairly long and straight with properties following a very similar building line, only shifting angles at junctions. This forms an important part of the character of the street scene and gives the area a uniformed appearance.
5. The proposal is for a single-storey extension to provide further retail floorspace. The extension would project forward from the front elevation and run across almost the entire width of the property. It would be constructed from matching red brick and have a flat roof.
6. Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) (CS) requires alterations to existing buildings to be based on a thorough, contextual analysis and provide good design appropriate to its location, scale and function. Policy BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development

Plan (Review) (2006) (UDP) says that alterations and extensions should respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building.

7. Although it has been extended, the front elevation of the host property and its attached neighbour retain the same building line as the other properties along Cardinal Road.
8. The retail units have forecourt areas instead of enclosed front gardens, nevertheless front building lines are retained, which is an important feature of the area. Although this was not the case during my site visit, the appellant says that the DIY store uses the forecourt for the outdoor display of goods. However, this does not involve permanent built development and materially alter the overall character of the built form.
9. The extension would have a somewhat functional and boxy appearance and it would noticeably project forward and would materially undermine the balanced appearance of this pair of semi-detached properties. Due to the uniformity of the building line along Cardinal Road the forward projection of this fairly prominent addition would also appear incongruous within the wider street scene. The extension would break up the regular building line along this part of Cardinal Road and would disrupt the uniformed pattern which would, thereby, harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area and therefore would conflict with Policy P10 of the CS and Policies BD6 and GP5 of the UDP and the Neighbourhoods for Living Guide (2003) which seek amongst other things to ensure that new development is of good quality design which reflects local context.
11. The proposal also conflicts with paragraph 135 (c) of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that new development is sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.
12. The proposal would increase the trading area available and help support the viability of this small business located within this residential community. I also note that the proposal does not raise any concerns in relation to highway safety or the living conditions of the neighbouring properties. Nevertheless, this does not outweigh the significant harm caused by the proposal.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and the material considerations, including the benefits to this business and the extra shop area that would be available to the local community, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with the development plan.
14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR