



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 1 February 2021

by Graham Wright BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3263590

2 Coniston Avenue, Headingley, Leeds LS6 2BD

- 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 Vincent Orr against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/03344/FU, dated 10 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a new two storey extension and detached single garage to existing domestic dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two storey extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is positioned in a prominent corner location. Although sited at an angle and with a side entrance door, the existing dwelling primarily fronts onto Coniston Avenue. The proposal would however create an additional, more dominant, frontage which would address Balbec Avenue. The design and orientation proposed would result in large sections of brickwork being attached to what are currently the existing front and rear elevations of the dwelling. In particular in views taken down Balbec Avenue towards the appeal dwelling, the proposal would present a blank two storey brick wall, which would form an incongruous visual feature in the street scene.
4. Furthermore, the design proposed would substantially unbalance the existing pair of semi-detached dwellings which the appeal dwelling forms one half of. Whilst any extension to one of the pair of such dwellings would alter their form and balance, the appeal proposal would have a severe visual impact, for the reason outlined with respect to the brick walls and by reason of the fact that it would turn the focus of the dwelling towards the Balbec Avenue frontage. Collectively, these considerations mean that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
5. The appellant refers to a previous planning permission (15/04317/FU) which they advise has recently been resubmitted and reapproved. I note their comments regarding the position of the entrance door and the absence of quoins on that approved scheme. However, that proposal would retain the

general orientation and positioning of the front and rear elevations of the dwelling, with first floor windows to the front and rear and with a set back from the front elevation. Overall, it would better assimilate as part of the pair of semi-detached dwellings onto which it would be constructed and into the street scene in general. This other permission is therefore not comparable to the appeal proposal in its impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

6. Whilst alterations have been made to other dwellings in the vicinity, including with respect to their window styles, my attention has not been drawn to any development which is similar in impact to that which is subject to this appeal. Therefore, this consideration can carry only very limited weight in support of the proposal, and it does not outweigh the harm I have found.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed two storey extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area by reason of its design, orientation and resultant impact upon both the pair of semi-detached dwellings and the street scene. Consequently, it would fail to accord with Policy P10 of the Core Strategy 2014, Saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Unitary Development Plan 2006 and Policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012, where they seek to protect the character and appearance of areas. There would also be a conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, where it seeks to achieve well-designed places.

Other Matters

8. I note that several letters of support were submitted by the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, however these do not justify a harmful development.
9. I also acknowledge that the appellants have sought to improve the property since it came into their ownership, that the previously approved extension may be more structurally difficult to construct and less environmentally friendly than the appeal proposal and that the proposals before me would provide off-street parking at the property. However, these matters also do not outweigh the harm that would arise from the proposed development.

Conclusion

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

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR