
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 2020 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 9 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3257086

26 Tyersal Park, Tyersal, Bradford BD4 8EY

- 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 & Mrs Skinner against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02240/FU, dated 14 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is proposed two storey extension and single storey extension to the side and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 26 Tyersal Park and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. 26 Tyersal Park is a semi-detached brick-built dwelling in a residential area. It is a corner plot, set back from the road and the driveway leads to a detached garage. The area around the site is characterised by traditional semi-detached properties of a similar size and design, set out in a generally regular pattern.
5. The appeal proposal is to construct a two-storey extension to the dwelling, as well as an additional single-storey extension to the side, which would be attached to a repositioned garage. The single-storey element of the proposal would include an additional room in addition to the garage and would be constructed with a flat roof.
6. The Leeds Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) guidance suggests that extensions should focus on the external appearance of the building, be of a size and shape which is in keeping with it and subordinate to it.
7. Whilst the two-storey element of the proposal would be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling and the roof line set down, the extension considered

as a whole would have a sprawling form and would be substantial in terms of its footprint in relation to the dwelling. Accordingly, it would not appear subordinate to the host property.

8. I note that due to the corner plot location of the appeal property, the plot is an unusual size and shape with an extensive area to the side of the property and that the proposal has been designed to make best use of this area. However, the proposal, due to its size, would fill the width of the plot and, due to its irregular shape, would not reflect the form of the host dwelling. The loss of space to visually off-set the bulk of the extended dwelling, coupled with the size and scale of the development, would mean that the proposal would appear as a dominant addition that would fail to respect the character and appearance of the property.
9. The development would be partly screened from view from the road by the position of the buildings and fencing. Nevertheless, it would be visible from certain vantage points on Tyersal Park and above the fence bounding the public footpath alongside the site. Whilst I note that a number of other properties on Tyersal Park have been extended, these extensions appear to be more limited in terms of their size and scale than the proposal before me. Given the harm to the character and appearance of the property, there would therefore also be some, albeit limited, harm to the appearance of the area.
10. I conclude therefore that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of 26 Tyersal Park and the surrounding area. It would therefore fail to comply with policies P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (2014) and saved policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) which together, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is appropriate in its context and that extensions respect the scale and form of the original building. It would also conflict with the guidance in the SPD and the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Other Matter

11. I acknowledge that the proposal would provide extended family accommodation. However, such private benefit does not outweigh the harm identified and does not therefore indicate that permission should be granted.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR