
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2025

by **E Heron MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3359583

Quiet Ways, 3 Beech Grove, Rothwell, Leeds LS26 0EF

- 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 & Mrs Andrew Jones against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/06543/FU.
 - The development proposed is: Demolish part of garage. Construct 2 storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is within a small cluster of large, detached dwellings set-back in their gardens behind a short, narrow lane. Each house has its own distinct appearance and massing, and they sit comfortably together as a small informal group. There is a distinct early twentieth century architectural style to some of the dwellings, including the appeal property, and this is a strong characteristic of the building group.
4. The appeal property is symmetrical, with centrally aligned porch and chimney, simple material palette, horizontal emphasis to the windows, and distinctive curved roof form. There is space to either side, and a deep set back behind the front garden. This space frames the dwelling and emphasises its visually distinct simplicity.
5. There is a shallow step back of the two storey side extension from the front face of the dwelling. This would provide little in the way of a visual break between the simple horizontal emphasis of the main house, and the vertical contemporary 'slot' feature. As such the appearance of the extension would jar with the simple architectural design and horizontal emphasis of the main dwelling. Furthermore, whilst a terracing effect with the neighbouring property, The Orchard, is avoided, the lack of a step back coupled with the proximity to the boundary, would unbalance the space that frames the dwelling, eroding its symmetry within the plot. For these reasons, the proposal would also be a discordant element within the street scene, and as I find that the development would fail to respond positively to the main dwelling and its context it would not accord with design principle HDG1 of

the Householder Design Guide, Leeds Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

6. The proposed rear extension and garage alterations would be contained to the rear of the appeal property, and they are proportionate to the dwelling. As such I accept these elements would not have a harmful impact. I also acknowledge that the proposal avoids harm to the Rothwell Conservation Area as it does not impact on its setting. Nevertheless, this does not provide sufficient justification for the harm caused to the immediate street scene and host dwelling.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. As such, the development conflicts with policy P10 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), Leeds Local Plan, and policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006), Volume 1: Written Statement, Leeds UPD Review. These policies require development to be appropriate to the original building, respect character and quality of surroundings, and to resolve design issues, amongst other things.

Conclusion

8. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no other considerations that outweigh this conflict. For the reasons outlined, above the appeal should be dismissed.

E Heron

INSPECTOR