



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3374764

9 Lee Lane East, Horsforth, Leeds, LS18 5RF

- 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 & Mrs Nick and Mary Bates against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/03407/FU.
 - The development proposed is two-storey side extension with integral garage; two-storey rear extension with Juliet balcony and single-storey rear flat roof extension with sky lantern; raising existing ridge height to create better ceiling height on the first floor and loft storage above with additional rooflights; single-storey front oak frame open porch extension; and demolition of garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension with integral garage; two-storey rear extension with Juliet balcony and single-storey rear flat roof extension with sky lantern; raising existing ridge height with additional rooflights; front oak frame porch; and demolition of garage, at 9 Lee Lane East, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 5RF in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 25/03407/FU, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings: 3715 02 (Proposed Plans); 03 (Location Plan) & 04 (Block Plan).
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials specified in the application.

Procedural Matter

2. The application form identifies the applicants as Mr & Mrs Nick and Mary Bates, whereas the appeal was submitted in the names of Mr Nick Dobson and Mrs Mary Bates. The right of appeal lies only with the original applicant, and accordingly the appeal proceeds in the names of Mr & Mrs Nick and Mary Bates.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, including whether it would preserve the significance of the nearby Horsforth Conservation Area (HCA) through development within its setting.

Reasons

4. The appeal property occupies a corner plot at the junction of Lee Lane East and St Margaret's Avenue. It is a mid-20th century detached dormer bungalow with brick

elevations and a steep pitched tile roof, set behind a low stone wall and timber fencing panels, with a detached garage positioned close to the front corner of the plot. The wider area displays a mix of single and two-storey dwellings of varied form, age and materials. The site lies outside, but opposite, the boundary of the HCA, and so falls within its setting.

5. The proposal would substantially alter the form and appearance of the dwelling. However, the surrounding streets exhibit variety in building height, roof forms and architectural expression. The corner plot and its generous proportions provide scope for a larger building without resulting in over-dominance. A clear separation to the side boundary would be retained, and removing the existing garage would enhance the spacious character of the plot. In this context, the change from a dormer bungalow to a full two-storey dwelling would not, in itself, cause harm.
6. In addition, the plans depict a coherent design. The raised ridge is moderated by a roofscape incorporating a catslide and hipped element, chimneys to articulate the roofline, and the porch would provide legibility to the frontage. Proposed materials would reflect the established local palette. Overall, the proposal would deliver a well-designed building of appropriate scale, responsive to local character while meeting contemporary living needs. It would therefore accord with the design principles of the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012), despite the extent of change proposed.
7. In accordance with section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the HCA. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires great weight to be given to the conservation of heritage assets.
8. For the purposes of this appeal, the HCA derives significance from its historic street pattern, particularly along Church Avenue/Long Row, and the cohesive character of traditional stone and slate-roofed buildings within its boundary, including the dwellings on the north side of Lee Lane East. While the appeal site lies within its setting, the existing dwelling makes a neutral contribution.
9. For the reasons given above, the proposal would remain commensurate in scale to surrounding buildings, would not interrupt key views into or along the HCA, and would use familiar materials and ordered proportions. The removal of the existing garage would also improve the view of Nos 16 & 18 opposite. Consequently, the setting of the HCA would be preserved, and its significance unharmed.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area, or the significance of the HCA from development within its setting. It therefore complies with Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (as amended by the Selective Review 2019), saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds City Council Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006), and Policy BE1 of the Horsforth Neighbourhood Plan (2019), which collectively seek high-quality design that respects its context and the historic environment. The scheme would also be consistent with national policy objectives for well-designed places and the conservation of heritage assets, insofar as the setting of the HCA would be preserved.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed an approved plans condition for certainty and a materials condition to ensure a satisfactory finished appearance.

Conclusion

12. The proposal accords with the development as a whole and with national policy on design and heritage. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR