
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025 by Sara Manson DipTP

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3362878

Fairview, 231 Hall Lane, Horsforth LS18 5EG

- 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 Andrew Victor James Sims against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/06987/FU.
 - The development proposed is described as 'construction of detached garage with attached car port; sliding gate to existing vehicular access, new pedestrian access with gate to existing stone boundary wall; new stone wall with pedestrian gate within site.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issues

3. The Council does not object to the proposed gates, and I have no reason to disagree. I have therefore focused on the remaining elements of the appeal scheme and, specifically, its effect on a) the character and appearance of the area; and b) highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a newly constructed and rendered detached dwelling, situated on a spacious, prominent, corner plot where Hall Lane meets Rawdon Road. An open gable porch introduces depth and a focal point to the simple and otherwise understated but well proportioned traditional frontage. The property has an elevated position which makes it noticeable from multiple vantage points along the adjoining highways, reinforcing its prominence within the local street scene.
5. The wider area is characterised by large detached and semi-detached properties of various design and materials, with many benefiting from detached or integral garages all setback from the highway behind generous landscaped gardens. All these elements create a pleasing consistency and even rhythm that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

6. Due to its intended location within the appeal site, the proposed development would significantly diminish views of the host dwelling, presenting as an unduly dominant and visually assertive feature. While the inclusion of glazed elements may suggest a lighter appearance, in practice, these can often appear solid, particularly when reflecting sunlight or surrounding vegetation, thereby contributing to the overall massing of the structure.
7. Although the proposed landscaping may, over time, soften parts of the development, I remain unconvinced that this would sufficiently mitigate its visual impact. By virtue of its design and siting, the proposal introduces a more substantial and enclosed form compared to the previously approved car port. As such, it would read as an unsympathetic and intrusive addition within the plot, undermining the host dwelling's simple and clearly legible design quality and proportions, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
8. An extant permission exists for a car port which includes a pitched roof. However, I understand it was designed to allow views through to the host dwelling beyond and thus reduce the prominence of its siting. There are sufficient differences between the effects of it and the appeal scheme for my findings thereon to stand.
9. As a consequence, the proposals would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and thus be contrary to Policy P10 of the Core Strategy Selective Review Leeds Local Plan (2019) (CS), and Policy GP5 of Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review) (2006) and the Framework which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is appropriate to its context and respects and enhances the character of the area through high quality design, having regard to size, scale, and layout.

Highway Safety

10. The appellant has submitted illustrated vehicle swept path diagrams demonstrating the turning radii and available space within the site sufficient to accommodate typical vehicle movements, allowing private vehicles to access and egress the site in a forward gear without the need for reversing or complex manoeuvres. Thereby minimising the risk of conflict with pedestrians or other vehicles that could otherwise compromise the safe operation of the highway for users. The information supplied satisfies me that the proposed arrangements would be both practical and safe.
11. Consequently, the proposals would accord with paragraph 116 of the Framework which sets out that development should be refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. I have not referred to Policy T2 of the CS, as it is strategic in nature and less applicable to site-specific safety assessments. Details of the Leeds Transport Supplementary Planning Document have not been provided.

Other Matters

12. The appeal scheme may improve privacy and security for the site's frontage, taking into account the appellant's circumstances and motivations for the proposed development, but it remains unclear as to whether this could not be achieved through other, less harmful means. These matters would not therefore be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have found.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. Whilst I have found for the appellant on the second main issue, this is as a result of a lack of harm which would be a neutral matter. There are no material considerations that would attract sufficient weight to indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan with which the appeal scheme would conflict owing to my findings on the first main issue. It is for this reason that I recommend the appeal is dismissed.

Sara Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR