



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2022

by M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3298204

89 Green Road, Leeds, W Yorks LS6 4LE

- 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 Andrew Omond against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01394/FU, dated 21 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension to form porch with tiled roof to existing bay window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No 89 Green Road is a semi-detached, white painted two storey house. It is located within a row of detached and semi-detached housing which is set both below and well back from the road. The area is characterised by traditional stone boundary walls with hedges, vegetation and trees creating a verdant setting.
4. The proposed single storey porch extension, plus pitched roof to the existing bay window, would follow a pattern of extending properties on the front elevation along this stretch of Green Road. However, these have been built in line with the gable wall of the house and are generally of a simple form with a pitched roof. In contrast, the appeal proposal would extend forward of the front of the house and wrap around the gable elevation. The combination of both a single pitched and hipped roof form, and the size and glazing pattern of the proposed window, would be more obtrusive and dominate the front elevation of the property. This would be compounded by the shared driveway between no 89 and no 91 Green Road which provides open views into the site from Green Road to the front.
5. The proposed development would therefore unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to policies P10 and P12 of the Core Strategy, saved UDP policies GP5 and BD6 and policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide where they state that new development should respect the character of the building and the townscape. It would also fail to accord with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework where

development should add to the overall quality of the area and be sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

6. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
7. For the reasons given above, I consider that the appeal should be dismissed.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR