



Appeal Decision

Site visits made on 20 May & 3 June 2025

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/25/3363977

The Meadows, North Road, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 5HG

- 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 P Murray against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/04691/FU.
 - The development proposed is side and rear extension; hip to gable roofs; front and rear dormer. Development of adopted highway to private drive (shared).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for side and rear extension; hip to gable roofs; front and rear dormer; development of adopted highway to private drive (shared), at The Meadows, North Road, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 5HG in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 24/04691/FU, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: 001; 003 B; 060 G.
 - 3) The turning head as shown on the location plan 001 and hatched on the Proposed Block Plan 003 B shall remain available and functional as such in perpetuity for residents of North Road, visitors, any servicing/deliveries and emergency services.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 18 March 2025, the Council granted planning permission for a revised scheme including construction of single-story side and rear extension with addition of rooms to first floor; roof alterations including gable roof to front; dormer windows to side and rear; and new rooflights, under reference 24/06217/FU. This extant permission is an option open to the appellant if the appeal fails and therefore has the potential of being a genuine fallback position.
3. I carried out a second site visit on 3 June 2025 to view the site from the adjoining garden of 8 Scotland Close.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached 1960s bungalow set within a spacious plot at the end of a long cul-de-sac road. Despite some use of stone cladding and a slate roof, its appearance remains, by and large, unremarkable and typical of its period. The surrounding area contains a mixture of dwelling sizes, age, design, and materials, all with different roof styles and configurations. The individuality of each dwelling is a notable feature of the street scene.
6. The host building already benefits from an extant planning permission for extensions on the same footprint, as well as various roof alterations including side and rear dormer windows and a front gable feature.
7. The appeal scheme includes an additional dormer window at the front. Although front dormers are not a common feature in the street, the site is not in a prominent location. Moreover, the dormer would occupy only a small proportion of the roofslope and would sit behind the new front gable wall, such that it would be subordinate to the whole. Consequently, there is no significant conflict with the guidance in the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document in this regard.
8. Other concerns were raised in relation to the extensive use of render, particularly on the new front gable, and in respect of the fenestration design and loss of the chimney. However, the design is an appropriate reflection of the contemporary aesthetic being pursued and forms part of a compatible design overall. Further, the significant variation in style, design, and materials within the street, including the presence of render and modern window styles, provides scope for extending and altering the property so as to improve its appearance, even where this would not reflect the design and appearance of the existing building. I am also mindful that decision makers should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes in an area where there is no strong justification.
9. Overall, whilst the proposal would significantly alter the appearance of the host building, I find no specific harm in relation to its siting, scale, form, detailing, and materials.
10. I therefore conclude that the development could be accommodated at the site without detracting from the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Thus, the proposal complies with Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), and saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006), which amongst other things, require development to be well designed, appropriate to their context, and respect the character and quality of their surroundings.

Other Matters

11. The effect on neighbouring occupants did not feature in the Council's refusal reasons and it is relevant that planning permission has since been granted for extensions of a similar size, siting, and nature, including dormer windows at the side and rear. Whilst I have had regard to the various concerns raised in relation to outlook, light, and privacy, the differences between the extant permission and the proposal are not such that they would give rise to a materially greater degree of harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupants. As such, the matters raised do not lead me to a different overall conclusion.

Conditions

12. As suggested by the Council, I have imposed the standard commencement and approved plans conditions for certainty. I agree it is necessary to impose a further condition to ensure the turning head remains available and functional in perpetuity in the interests of highway safety and convenience. However, conditions relating to external materials are not necessary to make the development acceptable in this instance, so are not imposed.

Conclusion

13. The proposal complies with the relevant policies of the development plan; therefore, the appeal should be allowed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR