



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 17 November 2020

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3257014

42 Birkdale Drive, Alwoodley, Leeds LS17 7RU

- 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 Opkar Shira against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01228/FU, dated 22 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is alterations involving two storey, first floor and single storey side and rear extension including new roof to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of the development that is on the appeal form and decision notice as it is a more comprehensive representation of the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene.

Reasons

4. A key feature of this part of Birkdale Drive is the regular spacing between the dwellings. The appeal property, and some others, have single storey garages at the side, but the separation at first floor level remains consistent and is a defining attribute which adds positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of this pleasant residential area.
5. The proposed side extension would significantly and noticeably reduce the gap to No 40 at first floor level. This would appear out of place in the context of Birkdale Drive's streetscene when viewed from the north and west. The effect would be exacerbated by the massing of the extension, which despite the small first floor set-back from the front, could not reasonably be described as a subservient addition owing to its height, gable width and combined size. Furthermore, due to the width of the gable, the side extension would have a notably shallower roof pitch, which would not be in keeping with the host property and neighbouring dwellings it would be seen in context with.
6. My attention has been drawn to other extensions in the area. One of the examples is for a single storey extension so is not comparable. The other example at 15 Birkdale Drive has notable differences in the scale of the

extension and the character of the street scene in that location. In addition, it is not viewed in the same context as the appeal property, such that it has very limited influence on the character and appearance of the area surrounding the appeal site. In any event, I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and found that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.

7. I therefore conclude that the development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. This is contrary to Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy 2014 (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), and saved Policy BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006). Amongst other things, these policies require development, including extensions, to be well designed, and to respect the scale and form of the original building and the character and quality of its surroundings.
8. The Council has also referenced its adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Householder Design Guide' 2012. I have afforded some weight to that document due to its role in supporting the relevant development plan policies and find conflict with its requirements for extensions to be subordinate, replicate the proportions and pitch of the roof of the main house, and to retain spaces between houses where it is important in defining the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

9. I have noted that the occupiers of No 40 have raised concerns regarding loss of light, privacy and also parking. These matters did not form part of the Council's refusal reasons and as I intend to dismiss the appeal for other reasons, it is not necessary for me to consider these matters any further as it would not alter the appeal outcome.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR