



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2020

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3251577

25 Arthursdale Grange, Scholes, Leeds LS15 4AW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Wayne Hickson against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/07334/FU, dated 22 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the extensions on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached house on the inside corner of Arthursdale Grange. Its design is typical of the surrounding area with properties comprising a mixture of detached and semi-detached dwellings, which are arranged neatly fronting the road with only small-scale variations to the generally consistent building frontage. However, due to the corner location, No 25 has increased prominence in the street scene and presents two frontages to the road.
4. The proposals would respect the form, detailing and materials of the host property, but would add considerably to the massing of the building. This would not be problematic when viewed from the south, as the two storey extension would not project beyond this frontage and would be seen in the context of numerous other two-storey side extensions. Nonetheless, from the east, the extensions would project markedly beyond the consistent building line of the houses on this part of the road. This, in combination with the considerable massing and depth of the extensions, would be an intrusive form of development in this part of the street scene, thereby causing unacceptable harm to its character and appearance.
5. In reasoning the above I have noted that until recently the property had a number of high bushes around the perimeter, which are said to have been untidy and reduced visibility along the road. However, there is no substantive evidence that this was problematic. In any event, their removal could have

been undertaken at any time independently of the appeal scheme, and has. I therefore give this matter limited weight in my assessment.

6. I have also had regard to the letter of support and I recognise that the extensions would provide additional space for the appellant's family in a manner that suits their budget. However, these are not considerations which would justify the harm that would be caused by the development.
7. I conclude that the extensions would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This is contrary to Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006), Policy HDG1 of the Leeds Householder Design Guide (2012), and Policy BE1 of the Berwick in Elmet & Scholes Neighbourhood Plan (2017), in so far as they require development to integrate with and contribute positively to the character and quality of the surroundings, among other considerations. In this regard, it is also contrary to paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR