



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2025

by **C Mayes CMLI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/25/3367911

1 Whitehall Grove, Drighlington, Bradford BD11 1BG

- 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 S Welham against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/07122/FU.
 - The development proposed is a two storey 1 bed dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is the side garden to 1 Whitehall Grove. This is a two-storey, brick-built end of terrace house within a large corner plot with gardens to the front, side and rear. The site is prominent in the streetscape when seen from both Whitehall Grove and Whitehall Road. To the rear of the site are several buildings forming part of an industrial estate that provide a contrasting backdrop to what is otherwise a predominantly residential area.
4. Except for a pair of semi-detached properties and a row of 5 terraced houses, Whitehall Grove is predominantly composed of short, evenly spaced, broadly symmetrical terraces of 4 houses with slightly stepped frontages. The end of each terraced block is terminated by a more prominent gable fronted house. The terraces have front gardens or parking areas that result in a spacious and open appearance. Each terraced block is separated from the next by a substantial gap. Additional open space is provided by the side gardens to the end terraced houses at the ends of the street which further contribute to the appearance of spaciousness and openness. In combination, the built form and open spaces give the streetscape a strong rhythm, and a uniform, well-balanced and spacious feel.
5. The proposed development is a part two-storey, part single-storey dwelling that would be attached to the side of 1 Whitehall Grove (No 1). The front elevation would replicate the stepped form of other houses in the terraced block, as would the proposed hipped roof. While the two-storey element would be the same depth as No 1, a single-storey element would project beyond the rear elevation.

6. The proposed dwelling would occupy most of the existing side garden between the host dwelling and the road. The side garden to No 1 appears marginally larger than others in the street. Despite the size of the garden, the proposed dwelling would be notably narrower than other houses in the host and other terraced blocks. The scheme proposes the use of matching materials and would draw on the architectural style of the host building, continuing the building line, stepped frontage and roof form.
7. However, these details alone do not guarantee a complementary and harmonious form of development and are not sufficient to allow the appeal because of the harm I have identified. The width of the proposed dwelling would be significantly less than the regular and repeated width of other houses in the terraced block and other blocks in the street. Furthermore, the proposed dwelling would have a substantial unbalancing effect on the appearance of the terraced block. Moreover, rather than being subservient to the host property, the proposed development would appear at odds with the composition of the terraced block and conspicuous in the streetscape.
8. The open spaces between each terraced block and at the end of terraces are a repeated element of the streetscape that positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area. Only limited infilling has occurred in these spaces along the street, and where it has, it is modest in scale and restricted to single-storey extensions or ancillary buildings. As such, these developments have either preserved the sense of separation between houses, as at 9 Whitehall Grove, or the overall sense of spaciousness, as at 2 and 16 Whitehall Grove. However, the proposal, despite retaining a front garden comparable with others in the street, would lead to the substantial loss of open space within the streetscape and a cramped appearance to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to a Lawful Development Certificate Ref 24/01953/CLP issued for an outbuilding said to have a gross external area of 32 sqm and height of 2m. Although this fallback scheme would also reduce open space, its modest scale, and detached and ancillary nature would result in less visual harm than the proposed attached dwelling, and so I give it limited weight in my decision.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Hence, the proposal conflicts with Policies H2 and P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended), September 2019, which seek among other things to ensure that development does not take place on sites which make a valuable contribution to the visual and spatial character of an area, and respect and enhance existing streets, spaces and buildings according to their particular local distinctiveness. It would also conflict with Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review, 2006, and the Neighbourhoods for Living Supplementary Planning Guide, December 2003, which together seek, among other things, to ensure development is based on a thorough analysis and understanding of an area and respects streets and spaces according to the particular local distinctiveness and wider setting of the place.

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge that the site has a low probability of flooding, is not within a conservation area and that the existing building is not listed. However, these points make no difference to my overall conclusion. I also note that the scheme may allow for appropriate private amenity space for both the proposed dwelling and No 1 and would benefit from on-street parking that would not result in harm to highways safety. However, adequate private amenity space and acceptable parking arrangements would likely be requirements of any acceptable form of development. Furthermore, the size of the private amenity space provided, and safe on-street parking may be benefits of the scheme, however, this neither outweighs the harm I have found nor change my overall decision.
12. The appellant asserts that the proposed development would be in a sustainable location, close to local bus services, and would meet aims to deliver housing, support small housebuilders and would contribute to the local economy. While the proposal may offer these social and economic benefits, they are insufficient to outweigh the significant harm identified above. An additional unit would make little difference to the overall supply of housing, and the support one extra household would provide to the local economy would also not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan 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 the appeal should be dismissed.

C Mayes

INSPECTOR