



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 August 2022

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/22/3302384

15 & 17 St Martins Grove, Potternewton, Leeds LS7 3LJ

- 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 P S Rai against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02677/FU[], dated 11 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is front double storey extension to both semi-detached dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal properties are a pair of two-storey semi-detached properties, located in a predominately residential area. The properties are brick built, with hipped roofs. There is off-street parking available to both properties, with low boundary treatments at the front. A design feature of many of the properties in the immediate locality is that of an existing front projection with bay windows to two storeys.
4. There are some differences in the nature of these two-storey bays, in that some are of circular design, and some are of square design. A number of the properties also benefit from a single storey front porch. It is apparent that a number of the properties have been altered, modernised and extended over time.
5. Whilst the properties in the locality are not identical, there is nonetheless a strong sense of coherence due to the principal design feature of the two-storey front extensions to the properties. This motif permeates throughout the cul-de-sac where the appeal properties are located. These projections are an important feature which bind this locality together and contribute in a positive manner to its pleasant character.
6. The proposed two storey extensions would replace the existing porches on both properties. The roofs would tie-in to the existing properties and the extensions would be built in materials to match the dwellings.

7. The proposals would result in a second two-storey front projection, to add to the existing double bay on both properties. Due to the width, height and projection, they would be of a significant scale and mass to the detriment of the façade of the existing properties, overpowering the frontage, creating a cluttered appearance to the front elevations with two separate front projections to each property.
8. They would be out of proportion with the existing characteristics and architectural style of the original hosts. Furthermore, it would not be reflective of the street scene, creating an unwelcome focal point with the cluttering of the front elevations by introducing a second set of two storey extensions to that elevation. Therefore, they would appear incongruous additions, disrupting the rhythm and scale of the existing dwellings within the immediate and wider street scene.
9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed two storey front extensions would harm the character and appearance of the host properties and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to policy P10 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy (2019 Review) and saved policies BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) which collectively, amongst other matters, expect development to be appropriate to its context and respect the character and quality of surrounding buildings.
10. I also find conflict with the design guidance set out in the Householder Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

11. I have noted the comments of the appellant including a number of nearby developments that appear to contradict the position of the Council. I do not have the full details of these alternative proposals, or their context and I have to determine the appeal on the merits of the case in front of me. I have identified harm to the character and appearance of the area with regard to this appeal and the presence of other similar development to the appeal proposals in another context does not make the proposal acceptable.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no other material considerations which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR