



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2025

by N Armstrong BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/25/3368123

32-34 Trentham Street, Beeston, Leeds LS11 6HW

- 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 M A Butt against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00674/FU.
 - The development proposed is retrospective application for garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On my visit I saw a garage on the appeal site in a similar position to that as shown on the appeal drawings. However, the submitted plans indicate a proposed garage that would be finished in brickwork. This would be different to the existing structure. My assessment is made on the basis of the details on the submitted plans, although I have had regard to the existing garage.
3. The appeal form sets out the reason for the appeal is that the Council has refused planning permission for the development. The appellant's submission includes a Planning Statement stating that a certificate of lawfulness is sought for a storage building under Section 191 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act). The statement also suggests that the appellant made an incorrect application at the time. However, the application form provided clearly states that the application leading to this appeal sought planning permission, not a certificate of lawfulness. It is evident that the Council has determined the application on this basis. I have therefore proceeded to deal with the case before me on its planning merits and on the basis that planning permission has been refused for the development.
4. As such, the lawfulness of the existing development is not a matter for me to determine in the context of this appeal made under Section 78 of the Act. It is open to the appellant to apply to the Council to have the matter of lawfulness determined under Sections 191 or 192 of the Act, and any such application would be unaffected by my determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the host properties and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is located in a prominent position towards the end of a group of terraced properties that front onto Trentham Street and adjacent to its junction with Back Lodge Lane. The ground floor of No 34 was in commercial use, along with a retail unit opposite, although the use of No 32 was not clear. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and characterised by terraces of red brick, two-storey buildings. The upper floors of Nos 32-34 comprise the original red brick of the terrace with the ground floor brick painted white. The adjoining property to the rear of the appeal site fronting Brompton View, which is also included within the red line boundary, has used a more modern and lighter colour brick effect cladding, which is also featured on some other properties in the area.
7. The proposed garage would be a relatively large, flat roof building on a highly prominent part of the street scene. I observed Trentham Street to be a busier through road for both vehicles and pedestrians in comparison to the other local terraces, and so the garage would have a significant impact on the visual amenity of the area. Due to its prominence and scale occupying the full extent of the land to the side of the appeal properties, the proposed garage would appear as a discordant addition within the street scene. Its flat roof design would also exacerbate the visual impact, appearing as an incongruous form of development in relation to the established character and appearance of the adjoining properties, the terrace and other properties in the surrounding area. Whilst the use of red brick to match the original brickwork of Nos 32-34 would be an improvement in appearance compared to the existing garage, I do not consider that this would be sufficient to adequately mitigate the adverse visual impact of the overall scale and design of the proposed building in this location.
8. The Council has raised concerns that the development would impact on the distinct spatial character of the area. They refer to the particular layout of the terraces to the rear of the appeal site where there is space between the end of these and Back Lodge Lane. Whilst the appeal scheme would remove this space to the side of Trentham Street, larger residential development has taken place in this wider group of terraces, continuing the line and built form of the properties on Stratford Terrace. Notwithstanding this, there would be harm to the street scene as a result of the appeal scheme for the reasons as established above.
9. Where I observed other outbuildings and additions to properties in the immediate area, I found these to be more subservient and better related to the host properties in terms of their scale and appearance compared to the appeal development. A red brick, substation building of flat roof design is situated opposite the appeal site on the corner of Trentham Street and Back Lodge Lane. Whilst this has some similarities to the appeal scheme, it is a standalone building of a functional design, which is better proportioned and sits more comfortably in the street scene at its corner location. Its presence does not justify the harm that I find from the appeal proposal.
10. The appellant's evidence indicates that a building has been present on the site for some time. However, even if this is accepted, it does not follow that the appeal development would have an acceptable effect on the visual qualities of the area.
11. I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host properties and the surrounding area. It therefore conflicts

with Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) and Policy P10 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) Leeds Local Plan. Amongst other things, these seek to resolve detailed planning considerations, including design, that extensions should respect the scale and form of the original building, and that the size, scale, design and layout of the development is appropriate to its context and respects the character and quality of surrounding buildings, the streets and spaces that make up the public realm and the wider locality.

Other Matters

12. The Council suggests that the development would provide some benefit to the occupants of the property with increased storage space. Whilst I have limited information before me from either party in terms of the use of the building, the benefit of any increased storage space would not justify the harm that I have identified. It has also not been adequately demonstrated that this development is the only way to achieve that objective.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Armstrong

INSPECTOR