



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3369969

3 Methley Drive, Chapel Allerton, Leeds LS7 3NE

- 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 and Mrs Mason against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/03096/FU.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed rear dormer to match same size as existing neighbouring rear dormers'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure and Main Issue

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 scheme. The main issue in regard to which is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Chapel Allerton Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

3. Chapel Allerton, with its medieval links to Kirkstall Abbey, retains a village character with the outer parts consisting of good quality 19th and 20th Century artisan terraced housing with original decorative detailing. The terraces maintain a cohesion and consistency in their use of brick and slate, regular chimney patterns and repetitive decorative details. Of which the appeal building is one. The significance of the CA therefore, insofar as it relates to the appeal, is primarily associated with the architectural and historical importance of the retention of original features and design consistency. This is supported by the Chapel Allerton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan 2008 (the CAA). Given their architectural importance and the positive contribution they make to townscape character, the CAA also advises that replacement of traditional detailing such as roof coverings with inappropriate materials and designs is a negative feature that effects both individual builds as well as the wider streetscape.
4. The proposed rear dormer would be a prominent, boxy addition that would occupy a significant portion of the rear roof slope and unacceptably erode the quality of its originality. There are dormer windows present on other properties in the vicinity. They are of varying age, design and size. Furthermore, I do not know their planning status, nor are they part of the overriding character of the area with unbroken roof slopes still the predominant form.

5. The dormer would accord with the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD) in terms of the use of matching materials, and in it being set in from the sides, eaves and ridge of the roof slope. However, its size and fenestration pattern would conflict with the guidance, which also seeks dormers to be as small as possible with a substantial area of the original roof retained and for window detailing to match the character, proportion and style of the original house.
6. As a result of the above therefore, the proposals would harm the significance of the CA which would neither preserve nor enhance its character or appearance. Its effect would be localised but long lasting. As such, the harm to the CA would be at the upper end of less than substantial for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Nevertheless, its conservation is a matter of considerable weight and importance. In such circumstances, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
7. The scheme would increase the living accommodation available for existing occupiers including providing the ability to work from home and although there would be some economic public benefit, during construction, this would be time limited in its effect. Ultimately, the mainstay of the benefits would be private. Therefore, the public benefits in this instance carry only very limited weight that would, by definition, be insufficient to outweigh the harm to the CA.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would conflict with Policies P10 and P11 of the Core Strategy Selective Review Leeds Local Plan 2019, Policies BD6, GP5 and N19 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan 2006 and guidance contained in the SPD, as well as the Horsforth Design Statement 2010 and the Framework. Together, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and are acceptable for the historic environment.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. The proposal would not accord with the development plan, when taken as a whole, and there are no material considerations of sufficient magnitude to indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR