
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2025 by S Jamieson BA (Hons) MPlan

Decision by C Carpenter BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3372014

11 St Johns Street, Oulton, Leeds LS26 8JT

- 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 Heather Miller against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02004/FU.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear and side extension, alterations to existing building envelope, and new outbuilding to replace existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

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.

Main Issue

3. The Council has raised no concerns with the proposed first floor windows, rear rooflights, entrance gates and outbuilding. On the evidence before me, I see no reason to form a different view.
4. Consequently, the main issue in this appeal is whether the proposed rear and side extension would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Oulton Conservation Area (OCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Oulton is an historic village with a varied development pattern, including many notable 16th and 17th century residences, traditional cottage rows, and later infill development. As outlined in the Oulton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (AMP) (2010), the area's layout and architecture illustrate the village's evolution from an agricultural settlement to one shaped by cloth, tanning, and coal mining industries. This layered history underpins the OCA's special interest and its significance as a designated heritage asset.
6. The semi-detached appeal property is part of a building identified in the AMP as 'positive' within the OCA. Its prominent street-facing position, traditional stone construction, modest scale, simple gable-ended form, slate roof, and largely original façade reflect the design and architecture of other period properties in Oulton and contribute positively to the village's historic character and, by extension, to the significance of the OCA.

7. While the existing boundary hedge provides some screening of the appeal site, given the appeal property's forward siting in its plot and the intervening distance from the neighbouring dwelling at No 13, the flank elevation of the appeal property is very prominent in views along St Johns Street. The siting of the proposed extension to the side and rear of the appeal property, in this instance, is therefore particularly sensitive.
8. Even accounting for the removal of the existing rear projection, the proposed extension would substantially increase the footprint of the host dwelling and project significantly beyond its rear elevation. When compared to the modest depth of the host dwelling, the proposed extension would read as a bulky and disproportionate addition to the property that would undermine its traditional proportions and scale and, in turn, the positive contribution it makes to the street and wider area. These findings are notwithstanding the relatively large plot size, or the proposed set-back from the building's principal elevation and use of matching materials and fenestration. The appeal scheme would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the OCA.
9. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. Given the scale and nature of the proposal, the harm to the significance of the OCA would be at the lower end of less than substantial having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The Framework requires that this harm should be weighed against any public benefits deriving from the proposal. I accept that the appeal scheme would involve the removal of a previous extension. However, this would not justify the harm that would arise out of what would be put in its place. The proposal would also provide additional accommodation for its occupiers, the benefit of which is essentially private in nature. I find therefore that there are no public benefits sufficient to outweigh the great weight of the harm to the significance of the OCA.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude the appeal scheme would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the OCA. It would therefore be contrary to Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) and Saved Policies BD6 and N19 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) which together, amongst other things, require proposals to provide high quality design and conserve the historic environment.
11. For the same reasons, the development would also conflict with the AMP, the guidance in the Leeds City Council Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) including HDG1, Policy DBE1 of the Oulton and Woodlesford Neighbourhood Development Plan (2021) and the good design and heritage conservation requirements of the Framework.

Other Matters

12. The points raised in relation to permitted development rights and design guidance for extensions outside the conservation area are of little relevance because the appeal site lies within the OCA, and planning permission is required and has been sought for the proposed development. Consequently, these considerations do not alter my conclusions on the main issue.

13. I do not know the planning circumstances or the development plan policies that applied at the time of the consideration of the examples of nearby single-storey projections referred to by the appellant. That said, from what I saw, the identified dwellings do not occupy the same prominent or visually sensitive position as the appeal property, nor do they make a directly comparable positive contribution to the character and appearance of the OCA. Accordingly, and notwithstanding some variety in the surrounding built form, these examples do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
14. The Council has raised no concern with the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers or with parking and access. On the evidence before me I see no reason to disagree. However, these are neutral factors that do not weigh in favour of the proposal.
15. I also note the appellant's concerns regarding the Council's handling of the planning application. However, there is no substantive evidence before me to suggest that the Council failed to meet its statutory consultation requirements or procedural obligations. In any event, such concerns do not alter my assessment of the appeal scheme.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

C Carpenter

INSPECTOR