



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2025

by **C Mayes CMLI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3355072

46 Armley Grange Drive, Armley, Leeds LS12 3QH

- 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 Matthew Cadden-Reed against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03455/FU.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side and front/porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the appeal was lodged the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been revised. I am satisfied there are no changes of any consequence for the main issue in this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property forms the left-hand half of a pair of two-storey semi-detached dwellings. The appeal property is located on a corner plot close to the junction between Armley Grange Drive and Armley Grange Crescent. The area is predominantly comprised of semi-detached dwellings, with the occasional detached dwelling, evenly spaced within plots with modest front gardens and longer rear gardens. The area has a suburban residential character. There is some variety in the architectural detailing of and materials used in each pair of semi-detached dwellings. However, the character of the area is derived, primarily, from the consistent and repeated pattern of paired dwellings, and the proportions and scale of development.
5. The appeal property, and neighbouring half of the semi-detached pair of dwellings, is constructed of red brickwork to the ground floor and rendered to the first floor, separated by a projecting string course of brickwork. The corners of the semi-detached pair are defined at first floor by brickwork quoins. The roof is tiled with red, double Roman concrete tiles. A square bay window projects to the front of each dwelling at ground and first floor. The original entrance canopy to the appeal property has been enclosed to form a porch. The roofline of the property has also been altered, removing the original hipped roof and extending the ridge to form a

gable end. However, the property remains largely unaltered in appearance and, along with the neighbouring dwelling, retains many of its original architectural features and detailing in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.

6. The appeal property follows a building line that is consistent with its neighbour and the neighbouring pair of semi-detached properties, Nos 42 and 40, with only bay windows and entrance canopies and porches to each dwelling projecting forward on their original alignments from the front elevation. These 4 dwellings, separated from the highway by evenly sized front gardens, form a distinct and balanced group in the street scene.
7. The front of the proposed extension would project beyond the line of bay windows and entrance canopies. It would, therefore, result in a prominent feature that would disrupt the established and harmonious line and composition of the group of dwellings as seen from the street. Moreover, the window to the front elevation of the proposed extension is out of proportion with other, and particularly original, windows. As such, the proposed extension would be at odds with the architectural character and appearance of the host property.
8. The appeal property, and group of dwellings it sits within, are seen from level ground to the front of the group. Given the sloping topography of the area, progressing along Armley Grange Drive, away from the junction with Armley Grange Crescent, the appeal property and group of dwellings are seen, obliquely, from rising ground. Even seen in this context, as the appeal property terminates the group of dwellings as described above, the proposed extension would still result in a prominent feature at odds with the form and appearance of the appeal property and established buildings lines.
9. When seen entering Armley Grange Drive from Stanningley Road the appeal property occupies an elevated position. The view toward the appeal property includes some mature vegetation, including 2 mature trees. Moreover, the appeal property at this point is separated from the highway by more extensive gardens enclosed by a low boundary wall. Despite this added separation, the end elevation of the appeal property remains prominent particularly given the elevated nature of the property when seen from this part of the street.
10. The bands of brickwork to ground floor, brick string course and rendered first floor continue from the front elevation of the appeal property onto the end elevation. This provides continuous and consistent architectural detailing and character across both elevations of the appeal property and the pair of semi-detached dwellings.
11. The blank side elevation to the proposed extension would also be prominent when seen from the street. Moreover, the side extension would reduce the sense of separation between the street and the appeal property, increasing the prominence of the proposed extension. Furthermore, the roofline of the proposed extension fails to respect the architectural character of the host property interrupting the clearly defined lines of ground floor brickwork and first floor render, and the architectural detailing of the string course and quoins. The mass of the proposed extension, projecting forward from the end elevation would not be seen as either complementary or subservient to the host property.

12. I acknowledge the proposed use of matching materials for the extension. However, this would make no difference to my overall decision in light of the harm identified above.
13. While properties in the area exhibit some variations in form, detailing and design, predominantly, each pair of semi-detached dwellings remain complementary to and in balance with each other and the character of area. I therefore note the appellant's reference to the Council's Householder Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), April 2012, that allows for front extensions where there is a lack of uniformity in the street scene. But I do not find that, in this case, there is a lack of uniformity in design and detailing. As such, the argument does not outweigh the general principle outlined in Policy HDG1 of the SPD of having respect for the scale, form and architectural features of the host dwelling and area that positively contribute to their character and appearance.
14. The appellant has also provided 2 examples of wrap-around single-storey extensions. However, neither of the examples is within the same area as the appeal site or directly comparable to the context of the appeal development before me. As circumstances vary from one site to another, they are of little relevance to my assessment of the merits of this appeal.
15. I also note the appellant's reference to Armley Grange School as a dominant feature of the area. However, given this building is not in residential use and predates the development of the area as a residential suburb its presence and variance in character makes no difference to my overall decision in light of the harm identified above.
16. Moreover, I note the appellant's reference to the Framework with regard to the presumption in favour of sustainable development. However, paragraph 131 of the Framework confirms that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and the appeal proposal falls short in this respect.
17. Taking the above into account, I conclude that the proposed development would result in a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. Hence, it would conflict with Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan, 2006, and Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy, 2019, which seek, among other things, that development should be appropriate to its context and respect the scale, form and detailing of the original building.

Conclusion

18. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

C Mayes

INSPECTOR