



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2025

by **M Clowes BA (Hons) MCD PG CERT (Arch Con) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3355844

442 Otley Road, Adel, Leeds LS16 8AD

- 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 Dominic Ward [Paradev Leeds Ltd] against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03137/FU.
 - The development proposed is described as 'part single part two-storey front extension, single storey rear extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form as there is no evidence before me that the appellant agreed to that used in the Council's decision notice.
3. The host dwelling is currently undergoing renovation. The front conservatory has been demolished and the rear extension and dormer have been erected. I observed that the design of the rear dormer, the full height glazing to the side and the pitch of the roof above the rear extension, do not reflect the details shown on the proposed plans. The Council has also raised concerns regarding a discrepancy in the size of the rear dormer between the elevation and second floor plan drawings. Nonetheless, I am satisfied that the plans contain sufficient detail to properly assess the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area. In reaching my decision I have assessed the development as shown on the submitted plans and not as built on site.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a detached 2-storey dwelling set back from Otley Road behind a landscaped front garden. It appears to date from the 1960's¹. Although the appellant suggests that there is variety and difference within the street scene there are a number of repeated house types, as well as a number of unifying architectural features.
6. Neighbouring dwellings are typically built in the Arts and Crafts style with a limited pallet of materials and features including 2-storey gable projections, gambrel style

¹ Engraved stone within the side elevation reads 'Regency Villa designed and built by Walter Mitchell 1964.'

roofs and curved bay windows. They are typically detached or semi-detached forms with driveways to the side and low walls and hedges to front boundaries. Gates where present, are discreet and consistently of the wrought iron type. The properties to the east of Otley Road including the appeal site, are set back behind a wide tree-lined highway verge. These factors combine to present a pleasant, verdant and spacious street scene and a cohesive character to the area².

7. The host dwelling is sited on a slight angle set back from the building line established by the semi-detached dwellings to the north and forward of No 440 Otley Road to the south. Currently, this slight variation is not particularly perceptible from within the street scene and it provides an appropriate transition between the 2 differing building lines.
8. Whilst acknowledging that the host dwelling is a later infill development and not of the same Arts and Crafts style as other dwellings within the street scene, its architectural influence is nonetheless apparent. The front elevation contains a projecting gable feature of limited depth, with horizontally proportioned windows to the front elevation. This provides a visual and contextual link to the style and form of the earlier neighbouring properties which share similar features and do not have flush front elevations.
9. The proposal seeks to extend the 2-storey gable projection forwards with a catslide roof and dual pitched dormer window alongside. The catslide roof would to some extent mimic the nearby gambrel style roofs of neighbouring dwellings. However, the gable extension would be substantially deeper than any other 2-storey gable within the street scene. It would result in a flush ground floor elevation that projects beyond the established building line to the north. Moreover, the form of the dormer roof would also contrast with the understated flat or gabled roofs belonging to the dormer windows found within nearby dwellings. The large overhanging eaves would not in this instance be tempered by a bay window feature. The cumulative impact of the design including the use of fully rendered elevations would result in a visually dominant extension, that would draw the eye to a negative degree.
10. Even if I could accept that the removal of the conservatory would be a benefit and that the proposal would raise the design bar, it is the failure to respect the established context of the appeal site that is the crux of the concern here. Whilst it is not necessary to slavishly copy what has gone before, the proposed front extension would nonetheless fail to respond to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene.
11. Similarly, the full height glazed entrance to the side would impose a modern style on the host dwelling, further eroding the original character of the dwelling and failing to respect the predominantly horizontal window proportions that are prevalent. Due to the gap between the appeal site and No 440, it would be visible from the street scene but the harm would be lessened by its siting on the side elevation towards the rear of the dwelling at a more oblique angle.
12. The proposal includes the provision of 1.8m high solid gates erected between 2 piers. Due to their design and scale, the gates would have a bulky and enclosed appearance that would contrast starkly with the low or soft boundary treatments to the site frontage and within the wider street scene as described above. The gates would thus form an incongruous feature that would detract from the verdant and

² As recognised by the appellant within the 'site and surroundings' section of his appeal statement.

spacious characteristics of the street scene. The limited width of the gates and their set back position would not sufficiently mitigate this harm given the absence of tall, solid structures from the front boundaries of dwellings in this locality.

13. The Council has not raised any concerns with regard to the proposals at the rear of the dwelling. Whilst the dormer window and single storey rear extension are of a large scale and mass, they would not be publicly visible.
14. Notwithstanding the acceptability of the proposed rear additions, the proposed front extension, side glazing and entrance gates would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. As a whole, the proposal would conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds Local Plan; Core Strategy (2019) and Policies GP5, BD6 and N25 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006). Collectively these policies seek good design and development that respects the character and quality of the surrounding area, objectives shared with the Leeds City Council Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012). Conflict is also found with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which seeks good design and developments that are sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

15. This proposal has sought to address concerns raised following the withdrawal of a previous scheme³. It does not however, automatically render it acceptable and I have found harm for the reasons given.
16. Reference is made to more recent housing development to the north of the appeal site, close to the junction with Church Lane⁴. It seems to me that these dwellings sit unobtrusively within their context utilising a projecting 2-storey gable feature with a recessed doorway position and horizontally proportioned windows. Although fully rendered, the use of pitched roofs above the ground floor bay windows breaks up and reduces the dominance of the render. This would not be the case with the proposal.
17. The appellant asserts that the Council has failed to adhere to the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Framework is clear that this presumption does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision-making. Where a proposal conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not usually be granted unless material considerations indicate that the plan should not be followed. I have found that the proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations to indicate I should take a different view.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan and all other considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

M Clowes

INSPECTOR

³ Planning application reference 23/07233/FU.

⁴ As I observed during my visit and is further depicted within photograph 6 of the appellant's statement of case.