



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2026

by **C Mayes CMLI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/25/3375339

100 Street Lane, Roundhay, Leeds LS8 2AL

- 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 S Michael against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application reference is 25/02657/FU.
 - The development proposed is alterations and front extension to existing restaurant/hot food takeaway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms the end unit of a terrace of Victorian buildings, originally constructed as dwellings. Despite a shift to predominantly commercial uses, the terrace retains a clear and coherent architectural rhythm, with its consistent building line, repeated proportions, and an open forecourt that allows its form to be appreciated.
4. The proposed extension would project substantially forward of the established building line. Owing to its siting, mass, and permanent form, it would introduce an assertive addition that disrupts the simple, unified frontage of the terrace. Even with its predominantly glazed construction, it would appear as an intrusive feature that fails to reflect the established character of the row or its relationship with the street.
5. Within the same terrace, a forward-projecting structure is present at Rand. However, from the evidence before me, this structure does not benefit from planning permission and cannot be regarded as part of the established character of the frontage. In any event, it does not share the scale or enclosing effect of the proposal before me, and it does not alter my assessment of the terrace as a whole.
6. The variety in shopfront styles and the range of activity within the forecourt, including outdoor seating, planters, parking and small-scale structures, is typical of a commercial frontage of this kind. These elements are, however, temporary, movable or incidental, and they do not alter the underlying clarity of the established building line or the coherent form of the terrace.

7. Nearby boundary hedging and a single street tree along the frontage may slightly reduce visibility of the proposed development in certain views. However, the hedging cannot be relied upon for long-term screening, and the tree's high canopy provides little filtering at pedestrian height. As such, these elements offer only limited visual interruption to views of the development and do not change the overall effect of a substantial permanent projection to the front of the terrace.
8. References have been made in the submissions to the Centre Boundary, the Primary Shopping Area and a Secondary Frontage designation. These identify the wider retail role of this part of Street Lane but do not define the detailed architectural character of individual frontages. My assessment of the proposal therefore turns on the immediate context. In this location, the terrace retains a coherent form, a clear and established building line, and a consistent relationship with the forecourt. Having regard to Policies P10 and P12 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy Review September 2019 (CS), it is these local characteristics that are most relevant to the consideration of the scheme.
9. The evidence also refers to comparable rateable values within the wider centre as an indication of the commercial significance of this frontage. Such matters do not relate to the design or architectural qualities of the frontage and do not alter the physical characteristics that define the contribution the terrace makes to the street. My conclusion on character and appearance is therefore based on the immediate townscape context.
10. The submissions refer to several other front extensions and covered seating structures elsewhere on Street Lane and in other parts of north Leeds. In each case, however, the surrounding context differs materially from that of the appeal site. The Deer Park sits as a detached building within a sizeable plot and has a different visual relationship with the street. The additions to Hesco Lounge and San Carlo Flying Pizza form part of a later twentieth-century parade whose scale and form bear little resemblance to the Victorian terrace at the appeal property, and they are separated from it by several junctions and intervening residential properties. Measurements have also been provided to demonstrate that the forecourt at the appeal site is comparable in depth to some of these locations. While I have noted this, the depth of the forecourt alone does not determine the effect of introducing a substantial forward projection within a terrace that maintains a clearly defined building line and a coherent form.
11. A further example at Culto has also been highlighted. While I have taken this into account, it sits within a parade of different character, with a broader frontage and a less uniform built form. Hence, the circumstances there do not assist in understanding the likely impact of a substantial projection in this more consistent Victorian terrace. Although these and other schemes referred to further afield illustrate commercial adaptations in different contexts, the circumstances in which they were approved differ sufficiently from those at the appeal site that they do not alter my assessment of the harm that would arise from the proposal, and in any event each scheme must be considered and determined on its individual merits.
12. In conclusion, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policies P10 and P12 of the CS and saved Policies GP5, BD6 and LD1 of the Leeds City Council Unitary Development Plan Review (2006), which seek to ensure that development is well-designed, responds positively to its

context, respects local character and built form, and safeguards the visual quality of the area.

Other Matters

13. The proposal would enlarge the internal seating area, improve accessibility and support the operation and viability of an established business, bringing some economic and community benefits. However, these matters attract only moderate weight, and do not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area identified above.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

C Mayes

INSPECTOR