



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2020

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3254362

45 Scott Hall Place, Chapeltown, Leeds LS7 3JR

- 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 Mrs Judy Harberd against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/07926/FU, dated 19 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is Part single part 2 storey rear/side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and living conditions of local residents.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is located at the top of the Scott Hall Place estate road and is an end property on a short terrace of four two storey houses that back onto recreation grounds of Scott Hall Playing Field. The appeal site is a corner plot with an attached garage to the side and a large rear garden.
4. The proposal would extend the dwelling to the side and rear in a part single storey and part two storey manner. There is a large mass of development proposed to the appeal site which is a relatively small end of terrace dwelling. The projection of the extension with both a two storey and single storey element would result in it appearing particularly long in proportion to the modest proportions of the host dwelling.
5. As a result of the extension layout, that is further emphasised by the numbers of complicated roof configurations proposed to combine the different extensions with the host dwelling and attached garage, it would create an unusual and discordant form of development to the host dwelling. It would not harmonise with it or appear subservient to the host dwelling but would instead jar with it. The use of high and long fenestration to the elevation facing east would further add to its discordant and unsympathetic appearance.
6. Although the site is well screened to the rear to its boundaries, part of the extension to the side with the sloping roof and dormer behind would be visible

from the street scene of Scott Hall Place. Whilst it would be set back, and despite the use of traditional materials to be employed to construct the proposal, nevertheless it would appear out of context in this environment with no other similar extensions, thus harmful to character and appearance of the street scene.

7. Moreover, the design does not accord with the advice contained within the Council's Householder Design Guide 2012 for extensions to respect scale, form, proportions and character and appearance of the main dwelling, with particular attention paid to roof form and window detail. The proposal would result in harm arising to the host dwelling and street scene as a consequence.
8. Therefore, it would not represent good design and would therefore be in conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy, Amended 2019 for development to deliver high quality design that is appropriate to its location and scale, amongst other considerations, and Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan 2006 for extensions to respect scale and form, and for development to resolve detailed planning considerations including design. It would also run contrary to the aims of the Householder Design Guide 2012 as well as the National Planning Policy Framework in its objectives to achieve well designed places.

Living Conditions

9. The proposal is located to the west of the attached No.47 Scott Hall Place. This dwelling has a narrow but relatively long rear garden. It would extend approximately 5.3m to ground floor and 3.2m to first floor and would be set in off the common boundary. The extension is also proposed to be set down from the host ridge line which would reduce the overall impact to No. 47.
10. Due to this, I am not of the opinion that the proposal would reduce sunlight levels and result in overshadowing to the garden to such a degree as to significantly compromise the living conditions of the occupiers of this dwelling.
11. I have taken account of the neighbour's concerns relating to overlooking and loss of privacy, however the side windows are high level to both ground and first floor, and this would reduce potential overlooking from inside, together with the extensive boundary landscaping providing screening.
12. Therefore the proposal would not be in conflict with Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan 2006 or Policy HDG2 of the Householder Design Guide 2012 in their aims for development to avoid a loss of amenity. Finally, I can find no conflict with the National Planning Framework in its objectives to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

13. I have viewed the examples of development that the appellant's consider are relevant to their case. At 159 Potternewton Lane, these are much more modest extensions and, in any event the precise details are not before me. No. 79 Newton Lodge is not a corner plot like the appeal site and the extension here is a modest and subordinate side extension. The dwelling at Scott Hall Square is a new build and does not follow the same characteristics as the appeal site. Other extensions to houses at 39, 40, 43 and 44 Scott Hall Place have also been brought to my attention. However, the precise details are not before me,

although they do not share the same design characteristics as the scheme before me.

14. There may be history at the appeal site for an approved scheme and the appellant's consider this proposal to result in less visual impact, however that former development has been considered acceptable to the Council.
15. The connectivity with the proposed extension and the garden, and the health and wellbeing associated, and the complications of finding a suitable design solution are noted, however this does not lead me to a different conclusion.
16. Issues pertaining to the objector's family's health and wellbeing and construction noise and disturbance levels are noted, although as I am dismissing the appeal, requires no further consideration.

Conclusion

17. The appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR