



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 May 2025

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3361837

69A Upper Wortley Road, Upper Wortley, Leeds LS12 4JN

- 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 Ashhad Mahmood against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/06694/FU.
 - The development proposed is Proposed gable end extension, loft conversion and dormer windows to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached bungalow set above road level where this part of Upper Wortley Road rises to the northwest. It is a double fronted bungalow with a hipped tiled roof. Although the bungalow has been extended to the rear in a modest way, it retains much of its original integrity. The local character is residential in nature with varying house styles although the street scene is predominantly of two storey dwellings where the unifying element is the facing red brick finish.
4. Its driveway sits adjacent to the dwelling and a garden to the front with steps dividing its two parts leading to a pedestrian gate onto the main road. The undeveloped front garden space provides a setting to it from the street scene and integrates with the similarly sized garden space adjacent.
5. The front building line of the appeal site sits on the same building line as the adjacent pair of semi-detached dwellings.
6. The proposal would remove the roof in its entirety as well as the chimney stack and replace it with a tiled pitched roof with three dormers spread across the front roof plane. Around half of the front garden would be removed to accommodate parking for three vehicles with a retaining wall required to support the remainder of the garden area.
7. A new pitched roof with brickwork to the gable ends and large dormer windows would be a very different design style to what is currently traditional to the bungalow. However, dormer windows are visible within the local area as are a range of roof styles. Its proportionality would be in character with the dwelling and

furthermore, the use of matching materials would assimilate into the host dwelling as well as with the surrounding materiality. On this basis I have no objections to this portion of the proposal.

8. The plot the dwelling sits within is small in size and an irregular shape to the rear. The area to the front of the dwelling is the sole garden space for the occupants and provides a natural softness to its setting. This amount of garden space is in character with the adjacent semi's and visually forms part of the pattern and character of the wider street scene.
9. By removing half of the garden to allow parallel parking space would substantially erode the garden. Therefore, by removing a large portion to parking would create an imbalance to the frontage of the site and also introduce a prominent L shaped retaining wall feature that is uncharacteristic of the wider street scene.
10. Even if the appellant were to enhance the external space through landscaping and high-quality materials are used to build the retaining wall and permeable paving installed, would not overcome the fact that a large area of external space that contributes to the character of the dwelling and is a positive contribution to the local area, would be removed for parking provision.
11. The appellant points to other similar arrangement for front parking spaces. However, I was not aware of any that I could see within close range of the appeal site, nor has the appellant provided me with precise details to consider. Off-street parking may reduce/improve highway and pedestrian safety although there is nothing before me to substantiate this statement. Overall, these considerations do not lead me to come to an alternative conclusion on the matter.
12. To conclude on this main issue, as a whole, the proposal would not accord with the design and character objectives of the Leeds Core Strategy Policy P10 and BD6; and Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan, which requires development proposals to resolve detailed planning considerations. It would be contrary to the broad design and appearance policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide. I find no conflict with policy HDG2 as this refers to impact of development on neighbours.

Other Matters

13. The appellant raises concerns with the way in which their proposal has been conducted by the council. Any concerns they have relating to unfairness should be conveyed to the Council in the first instance and is not within my jurisdiction to comment.

Conclusion

14. Although I have concluded favourably with regards to the extension to the dwelling only, as a whole, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no other considerations which indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR