



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022

by C Megginson BA(hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/21/3289637

123 Hall Park Avenue, Horsforth, Leeds, LS18 5LY

- 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 Nick & Megan Malleson against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/06812/FU, dated 7 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'proposed extension & alterations to existing house plus associated internal and external works'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a semidetached dormer bungalow on a plot that tapers to the front. There are a mix of property types arranged around a cul de sac. Some have been altered through extensions. General form is simple, with buildings arranged conventionally, set back from and facing the road with parking to the front and sides. Plot sizes vary, but buildings are arranged such that gaps between them and their boundaries contribute positively to a sense of spaciousness in the street scene. The proposed works would include a two storey side extension, reducing to single storey at the rear.
4. The tapered nature of the site would give rise to an awkwardly shaped side section which, due to utilising a number of different roof forms and a floating first floor would appear contrived and overly complicated. In addition, and despite being set back from the front and set down from the existing ridge, the complete two storey appearance of the side section, along with its width, would visually dominate the existing, noticeably more modest, host building. Furthermore, and due to the space the extensions would occupy, built form would all but fill the sides and rear of the plot, appearing crowded and eroding the spaciousness of the street scene.
5. The appeal scheme would therefore result in an incongruous and dominant form of development that would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. As such, it would conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (2019) and Saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006), which require new

development to respect the character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality. It would also be contrary to the guidance in the Leeds City Council Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012), which states that 'two storey side extensions should not exceed two thirds of the width of the main house'.

6. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework), which states in paragraph 130 that planning decisions should ensure that developments will add to the overall quality of the area and are sympathetic to local character.

Other Matter

7. I note that the adjoining property features a two-storey side extension, however, the design of this extension retains a symmetry with the host property and as such is not, in scale or visual terms, comparable with the appeal scheme. I also recognise that the appeal site is only visible within a small local context, this would not be sufficient to make the proposed development acceptable.

Conclusion

8. The appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

C. Megginson

INSPECTOR