



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2022

Decision by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/21/3288867

67 Carr Manor Drive, Moortown, Leeds LS17 5AP

- 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 B Hussain against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/06283/FU, dated 20 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is proposed front double storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. No Statement of Case from the appellant has been submitted with the appeal and I have proceeded on the basis of the information before me.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

4. The local area is residential in character. Carr Manor Drive consists of detached and semi-detached houses flanking each side of the road. These houses are located in a planned housing estate of a consistent style and design, with curved double height windows to the front elevation and hipped roofs a recognised feature.
5. The appeal dwelling occupies a wide plot and is prominent within the street scene as it is located on the corner with Carr Manor Drive and Carr Manor View. A porch has been added to the dwelling and is of a modest scale and typical design. This would be removed to accommodate the proposal that would be centrally positioned and two-storey in height with a hipped roof.
6. A projecting extension to the front elevation as demonstrated, and its proposed scale would appear uncharacteristic in this location where houses are of a uniform architectural composition that demonstrates strong harmony. As there was no evidence of other similarly designed extensions within the street scene, this would further emphasize its incongruous appearance. The proposal would not represent good design and would therefore cause adverse harm to the character and appearance of the local area.

7. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue, due to the design and location of the proposal, it would not appear as a subordinate extension and would not respect the articulation of the host dwelling or integrate with the street scene. Thus, it would be contrary to Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy, Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Unitary Development Plan Review 2006, Policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document and National Planning Policy Framework in their combined design aims.

Conclusion

8. The proposal would 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. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR