



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3374158

1 Calverley Road, Oulton, Leeds LS26 8JD

- 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 Karen Wood against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/03345/FU.
 - The development proposed is conversion of existing garage into habitable annexe, with new rooflights and wrap-around extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and area in general.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a substantial detached two storey predominately stone property situated within a principally residential area. Properties in the area vary in scale, design and age. Access into the site is off a roundabout at the junction of Calverley Road, Leeds Road (A639), and Rothwell Lane.
4. The appeal site is located with the Oulton Conservation Area and adjacent two listed buildings, Number 5 (Holly Cottage with number 3 Calverley Road a Grade II listed building and The Nookin a Grade II* listed building.
5. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA Act) requires decision makers, when considering whether to grant planning permission, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any feature of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. A similar requirement applies to conservation areas under the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the LBCA Act where I am required to have special regard to the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the area.
6. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposal on such an asset. This is irrespective of the level of harm.
7. The Oulton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2010) (the Appraisal) confirm that the organic development of the village has produced a

varied and mixed pattern of built form. Larger residential, institutional, and religious buildings set within generous plots are interspersed with rows of smaller cottages occupying more finely grained parcels of land. While buildings generally front the street, the building line is irregular, with some structures positioned directly at the pavement edge and others set further back behind garden frontages.

8. The Appraisal further notes that the conservation area has also accommodated a notable degree of infill development. The private grounds of the larger properties have been progressively developed through the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. This infill has taken the form of individual plot development as well as small cul-de-sac schemes, further diversifying the built character of the area.
9. The appeal property is identified as a positive building in the Appraisal which is noted as being an unlisted structure that make a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area. The appeal property incorporates a hipped roof, traditional stone detailing, and prominent chimney features, the elevations of the appeal property are simple. The property occupies a generous plot with a substantial rear garden and a driveway/parking area extending across the front and side of the dwelling.
10. The building subject to this appeal is a detached double garage positioned to the rear of the host dwelling and accessed via a driveway along the side of the property. A gravelled hardstanding area is situated to the front of the garage, providing parking space. The structure is approximately one and a half storeys in height, constructed of brick with a pitched tiled roof. A high boundary wall separates the garage from the adjoining property.
11. During my site visit, I observed that the garage is partially screened from Calverley Road due to its position at the rear of the plot, combined with mature landscaping and boundary treatments. Nevertheless, the surrounding properties retain views of the building, albeit some screened to a degree by the high boundary wall.
12. The proposed annexe would comprise open plan living room, dining and kitchen, along with a bedroom, bathroom at ground floor. The upper floor would form a large mezzanine snug. This configuration would establish the annexe as a fully self-contained residential unit with independent facilities for day-to-day living.
13. While annexes can offer all amenities for habitation, they should functionally be part of the same residential planning unit as the main property. I have not been provided with substantive evidence to confirm how the annexe would be used to ensure a functional relationship with the host property.
14. The proposed development would extend the garage to the side and front creating a wide and visually detailed façade, incorporating multiple roof forms, a variety of window designs, and a canopy above the principal entrance. The scale, design, and use of reclaimed red brick would not reflect the simpler form or character of either the host property or the existing garage. Consequently, the proposal would appear as an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development.
15. The physical arrangement of the site, including the separation of the garage and hardstanding from the host property's rear garden by a boundary fence, the presence of two vehicular entrances and parking to the front and side of the property, would make it straightforward for the resulting building to function as an independent dwelling. Combined with the visually detached form of the

development, which fails to relate to the host property which is a positive building within the conservation area, the proposal would create both a physical and functional separation from the main dwelling.

16. The proposed development would not harm the significance of the conservation area or the adjacent listed buildings, given the pattern of development in the area and the screening of the site. Notwithstanding this I find that the development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and area in general.
17. There is conflict with Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), Leeds Local Plan, Policies GP5 and N19 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Policy DBE1 of the Oulton and Woodlesford Neighbourhood Plan (2021) which amongst other things seeks to ensure developments are of good design and appropriate to character of the area.
18. There is conflict with Policy HDG1 of the Leeds City Council, Householder Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document (2012) which seeks to ensure development respects the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality. I also find there is conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), which seeks to ensure good design of developments.

Other Matters

19. The appellant contends that the garage is in a poor condition with little architectural quality and that the proposed development would visually improve the conservation area. I disagree, the existing garage whilst high is domestic in appearance with simple detailing which compliments the host property whilst it maybe in need of repair, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

20. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR