



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2022

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3306600

5 Holt Park Way, Adel, Leeds LS16 7QR

- 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 M French against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02485/FU, dated 31 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is proposed two storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed two storey side and single storey rear extension at 5 Holt Park Way, Leeds LS16 7QR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/02485/FU, dated 31 March 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Dwg No: 1301/22/01; and 1301/22/02 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached two-storey dwelling located in a suburban residential housing estate. The design of houses in the estate varies, although there are repeated features and house types, such as the host property's house type. This has a gable facing to the front with a long roof slope on one side containing a large flat roof box style dormer. This gives the property an unbalanced appearance. In my view, it is the density, positioning of houses set back from the footway, the soft landscaping, including many maturing trees and the estates open qualities that contribute most to its attractive character, rather than the individual design of the houses.
4. The proposed side extension would not be set back from the front façade. However, it would be set down from the ridgeline of the gable facing the front, ensuring it would be subservient in height. The extension would replace the

- existing garage, which projects slightly forward of the front elevation, and would build above the existing dining room, subsuming the existing long roof slope. In this regard, on this house I do not consider it to be an inappropriate design response to maintain the same front façade throughout.
5. The design of the property would be altered through the loss of the unbalanced front façade and box dormer, and it would appear a clearly larger two-storey dwelling. However, matching materials and fenestration would ensure that it would still harmonise with the original features of the host dwelling.
 6. The property sits at the end of a cul-de-sac and adjacent to a pedestrian footpath link. The neighbouring property on the other side of the pedestrian footpath is on a higher ground level and, as such, a spacious gap would remain between the two buildings. Moreover, the adjacent dwelling to the north east is orientated at a different angle to the host dwelling in the street scene. As such, I am satisfied that in this location there is the capacity for the proposed larger house without being harmful to the wider street scene.
 7. The single storey rear component would be very modest in scale and proportions, with a small lean-to roof which would be compatible with the host. With the bulk of the development being to the side, the spacious character that positively contributes to the area to the front and the rear of the building would be preserved.
 8. There are other houses in the estate, which have been altered very recently in a similar manner. Whilst I note that the Council consider them to be harmful having now been built. They do, nonetheless, form part of the existing estate. I have, in any case, assessed the proposal on its own merits, including in relation to the housing in this cul-de-sac. Overall, its resulting design would not appear an incongruous overly excessive design within the estate, or in the cul-de-sac. I therefore find that the design would be an appropriate scale and design in this location.
 9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, I find no conflict with Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan, Policy P10 of its Core Strategy or Policy HDG1 of its Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that alterations are of an appropriate scale and design to the existing building and the wider context.
 10. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary in the interests of precision, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord to those submitted with the application. A condition concerning external materials is required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
 11. For the above reasons, the appeal is allowed subject to conditions.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR