



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by **Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3374434

1 Oaksfield, Methley, Leeds, LS26 9AE

- 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 Richard Lickley against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/04133/FU.
 - The development proposed is described as *‘Two storey side extension and replacement of existing windows with anthracite UPVC frames’*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The Council’s decision notice includes a ‘Juliet balcony to rear’ in the description of the proposal and as this describes the proposal more fully, I have considered it on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

4. 1 Oaksfield is a semi-detached, two storey dwelling of a traditional, Victorian/Edwardian style with a pitched roof. It occupies a large corner plot which faces onto Oaksfield, an unmade no through road, with a side elevation onto Pinfold Lane, a busy residential through road and bus route. The nearby dwellings on both roads are of a similar age and style, many retaining their original form and detailing that contribute positively to the period character of the area.
5. The proposed two storey side extension, at 3.65m in width, would amount to more than two-thirds of the width of the original dwelling and this would be contrary to the guidance in the Council’s Householder Design Guide SPD (2012). It would also fail to achieve the advised 2m set back from the front elevation and would align with the rear elevation. The proposed ridge would be set down only very slightly from the existing ridge. As such, the extension would not be sufficiently subservient and would be overly dominant, detracting from the original form and character of the dwelling which would be particularly noticeable when viewed from Pinfold Lane. As the adjoining dwelling has not been extended to the side, it would also unbalance the pair which would be seen clearly from Oaksfield.

6. I accept that some of the nearby dwellings at Oaksfield, notably nos 5 and 7, have been extended in a similar manner but those appear to be older extensions that may predate the Council's SPD, and in any case, are set back more from the front elevation of the original dwelling. Moreover, they do not have the prominent corner position of the appeal site and are less clearly seen from Pinfold Lane.
7. I also share some of the Council's concerns regarding the detailing of the design. Whilst the high evergreen laurel hedge along the side boundary would fully screen the wide bifold windows in the side and rear elevations at ground floor level from Pinfold Lane, the tall first floor windows and door that would open onto the proposed Juliet balcony to bedroom 2 on the rear elevation would not reflect the size and proportions of the existing, original window openings and would appear as a discordant feature. The lack of matching head and cill treatments would also fail to reflect the detail of the existing building.
8. Together, those aspects of the design that I have identified above, would fail to respect the traditional scale and form or reflect the original character of the dwelling, thereby causing significant harm to its character and appearance and in turn, to that of the street scene.
9. I have noted the appellant's submissions that the property is uninhabitable, in a state of years of decay and no investment with rotten floor boards, damp, in need of a complete rewiring and has weakened floor structures. However, I see no reason why this proposal is necessary to address those matters and am not persuaded that there is not a more acceptable way in which to achieve some additional accommodation.
10. Thus, I find that the proposal would be contrary to development plan policies P10 of the Council's Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) (CS) and GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) (UDP) which together seek to ensure that development respects the scale, form and detailing of the original building and protects the visual amenity of the area with high quality design.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR