



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3365213

514 Scott Hall Road, Leeds LS7 3RA

- 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 O Parkash against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00074/FU.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension at 514 Scott Hall Road, Leeds in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 25/00074/FU, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PP-13671623v1, 24127-3 and 24127-2.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a side extension, with a flat roof, that would link into the existing rear addition. The council have not raised a concern with regard to the design, only with regard to the impact on the spatial characteristics of this corner plot and the properties behind on Scott Hall Crescent. Despite this being a relatively prominent corner position, I accept the council's view with regard to the design as the flat roof of the extension would ensure that it would have very little prominence within the street scene when viewed from Scott Hall Road as it would be largely screened by the hedge. When viewed from Scott Hall Crescent, it would be viewed in association with the existing large rear extension and would generally match its form.
4. With regard to the spatial characteristics of this immediate area, there is actually little perceived unity with regard to this property and the other nearby properties. This dwelling and its attached neighbour sit squarely facing the main road whilst the corner properties opposite are set at an angle. The leisure centre sits further back from the road and is of an entirely different design, as are the commercial buildings

beyond. Whilst there is some uniformity with regard to the positions of properties within Scott Hall Crescent, as the road curves away to the north, this uniformity is not apparent from the main road. The appeal property, although of a similar design, is viewed as being clearly separate from those properties and does not add to their character or setting. The spatial arrangements of the appeal property and the first property in Scott Hall Crescent are also significantly different. As there is no clearly apparent perceived unity in layout, the council's concern with regard to changes to the side of the appeal property are overstated.

5. Given the above, the proposal would sit relatively unobtrusively to the side of this dwelling. Its low height would ensure that it would have little wider prominence and in any event, extending to the side of this property would not materially alter the character of the area as there is no existing perceived unity in the layout of buildings in the vicinity. In these circumstances, there would be no conflict with the expectations of policies P10 or P12 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019); or policy GP5 of the Unitary Development Plan Review (2006).
6. Reference is made to the council's Supplementary Planning Document: Householder Design Guide 2012 and particularly the design requirements of policy HDG1. The guidance supports side extensions generally. It advises that care should be taken with corner plots when the extension would be visible from two streets as the design should be suitable in relation to both. It also makes reference to the need to take account of the building line of the side street. As already identified, the building line of the side street is not critical in these circumstances given the curved nature of the road and the limited contribution the appeal property makes to the character of the properties to the rear. The proposal does not therefore conflict with the design expectations of the guidance or policy HDG1. It similarly does not conflict with the design aspirations of the National Planning Policy Framework.
7. In conclusion, the proposal would not detract from the character or appearance of the area. As there are no other matters that weigh significantly against the proposal, I allow the appeal.
8. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and the details of the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. The plans set out that the details of the materials to be used would match, so no further conditions are required.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR