



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3366975

1 Grange Terrace, Grange Road, Yeadon, Leeds LS19 7AE

- 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 Wayne Huddleston against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00554/FU.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension; new and altered doors and windows to front, rear and side; roof lights to front and rear to form room in roof space; alterations to existing detached garage incorporating new pitched roof and replacement doors and windows.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Yeadon Conservation Area (YCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires when determining proposals in conservation areas that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. At paragraph 210 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), it sets out matters which should be taken into account including sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
5. The YCA includes a series of predominantly 19th Century two storey stone terraced streets in a grid layout with strong building lines, high levels of enclosure and regular plot widths. Repeated house types and interesting architectural features including prominent headers and sills as well as the presence of traditional materials present a strong, cohesive rhythm to the area. This is enhanced by the consistency and even rhythm of openings to the dwellings. It is this spatial composition and architectural quality that shapes the significance of the YCA. As an end terrace property, the appeal site occupies a visually prominent position in

the street scene and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the YCA as part of the generally uniform Grange Terrace.

6. The removal of the stone sill and widening of the existing window opening to accommodate the bi fold doors to the front elevation and the Juliet balcony to the rear would both result in unfamiliar forms of development which would disrupt and detract from the otherwise broadly cohesive appearance of the terrace. This would be exacerbated by the doors' grey aluminium casement which would directly contrast with the existing white examples in the terrace and wider area.
7. The alterations would be particularly harmful given they would be to both the front and rear of the building. Their discordance would therefore be very noticeable in public views from the street particularly when approaching the site from both directions on East View. A previous permission at the site related to changes to the rear only. This does not justify the specific harm I have identified having regard to the wider character of the terrace and the above legislative provisions. In addition, I am unsure of the exact details of the examples of altered windows elsewhere and, specifically, what their planning status might be. This does not sufficiently sway me from my findings.
8. The proposals would subsequently detract from the heritage significance of the YCA which lies in part with the form, scale, materials and detailing of the buildings. In the context of the Framework, the level of harm would be less than substantial but nonetheless important and at the upper end thereof, given the negative effects of these works on both the character and appearance of one of these key buildings in the YCA. Paragraph 215 of the Framework states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, such should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
9. The removal of the existing conservatory to the rear and its replacement with a more appropriate single storey addition in stone is noted. However, whilst this would preserve the character of the ground floor of the rear elevation, the harm I have identified in regard to the windows elsewhere to the dwelling would still be present. Furthermore, there is nothing to suggest that the replacement extension could not be carried out without the harmful window alterations to the first floor and front elevation. As a result, this limits the weight I can afford the removal of the conservatory.
10. The public benefits would be limited. Given the degree of harm I have found that would arise from the appeal scheme and the statutory protection afforded to Conservation Areas, such benefits are not sufficient to outweigh it. The proposal would thus fail to accord with Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds Core Strategy 2019 and saved Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006. Amongst other things, these policies require proposals of good design, where the historic environment, including historic buildings and townscapes will be conserved and enhanced.

Other Matters

11. The appellant refers to a fallback position of erecting a Juliet balcony to the rear under the permitted development regime. Namely Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). There is no evidence before me that such a position has been formally established for the appeal site. Nor have I seen an alternative scheme

setting out how this might be achieved. Furthermore, and as outlined by the appellant, the proposal before me would not constitute permitted development, and I have concluded that it would result in harm to the character and appearance of the YCA.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there is nothing sufficiently compelling to find otherwise. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR