



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2021

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/21/3280218

89 Grove Farm Crescent, Cookridge, Leeds LS16 6BZ

- 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 Gillian Waite against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04341/FU, dated 16 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is Single storey side extension, dormer loft conversion with hip-to-gable extension and alteration to the existing parking.
-

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
 - Highway safety

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal bungalow sits on an elevated position facing Tinsill Lane and is accessed from Grove Farm Crescent. The character of the crescent consists of other similarly designed semi-detached bungalows with two storey houses also in evidence.
4. The proposal would alter the hipped roof to that of a gable end together with an extension to the north west elevation and rear dormer. It is noticeable that there are other dwellings seen locally with gable end extensions replacing the original hipped roof and as a consequence, an imbalance to the symmetry of the semi-detached bungalow has occurred in this instance.
5. The proposal to alter the original roof form to the dwelling would therefore not appear as an uncharacteristic addition within the street scene. However, the gable end roof, proposed single storey extension with bulky hipped roof over and large flat roof dormer would, as a combination of roof formats, appear as a disjointed and prominent form of development. This would have a visually intrusive and detrimentally harmful effect on the host dwelling.

6. There may be examples of alterations to bungalows brought to my attention by the appellant. However, these extensions are not precisely the same as the proposal before me. Consequentially, the proposal would not amount to good design and would instead result in harm arising to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and to the local area.
7. There may be the opportunity for the appellant to carry out the works to the original roof under permitted development and this is a genuine fall-back position that they could explore. However, the proposal before me relates to a combination of extensions whereby the totality of the scheme is before me to be determined, and not as individual additions. Furthermore, an absence of objections from local residents to the proposal neither weighs for nor against it.
8. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue, the proposal would not represent good design and would conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy 2019, and the 'saved' Unitary Development Plan policy BD6 in their combined design aims.

Highway Safety

9. Although the existing garage may not be used for parking, there is off-street parking available within the curtilage of the appeal site. From my inspection it appeared that there is sufficient space to park two household vehicles one in front of the other along the paved drive.
10. This existing parking area would be removed to accommodate the proposed extension. The submitted plans indicate that there would be space within the site for dedicated off-street parking.
11. There is nothing before me to lead me to the view that this space would not be sufficient to accommodate two vehicles within the curtilage of the site. Therefore, there would be no net loss to the parking available. It would not result in a detrimental highway safety issue.
12. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue, the proposal would be compliant with policy T2 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy 2019 in its aims to secure adequate parking provision.

Balance and Conclusion

13. Although I have found in favour of the proposal in relation to highway safety, I have not found in favour with regards to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. It would thus lead to conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR