



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3307721

27 Hollin Park Crescent, Oakwood, Leeds LS8 3HH

- 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 Ms Libby Harborne against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/04338/FU, dated 21 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is a front porch.
-

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 host building and street scene.

Reasons

3. Hollin Park Crescent is part of a large, planned housing estate characterised by pairs of hipped roof, semi-detached houses and short terraces of a similar age, style, and materials. These are generally set back from the road behind short front gardens with low boundary hedges. The general consistency in appearance and layout gives Hollin Park Crescent and the surrounding streets a strong cohesive character.
4. The appeal property is one half of a pair of semi-detached houses and is typical of the prevailing character. Both houses have unaltered frontages and retain their original form and symmetry. A distinctive design feature of this commonly occurring house type are the central full-height bays which are joined at ground floor level by a lean-to roof.
5. Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (amended 2019) (the CS), saved Policies BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds City Council Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) (the UDP), and the Council's 'Householder Design Guide' Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (the SPD) seek to ensure that development is of good design which, amongst other things, respects the scale, form, proportions, and character of the original building and wider locality. In relation to porches, the SPD advises that these should be small, sympathetically designed, and unobtrusive structures.
6. Although the proposed porch would represent a relatively modest addition to the building, it would nonetheless be a highly prominent and disruptive element. Its significant projection and gable-fronted design would diminish the

bays as a distinctive feature and upset the overall balance and symmetry of the front elevation, thereby harming the character and appearance of the host building and street scene.

7. I have taken account of other existing porches in the area, but they are firmly in the minority and therefore have only a limited influence on the character and appearance of the area surrounding the appeal site. The front extension at 15 Hollin Park Crescent is, in my view, a similarly disruptive element on that building, but it is set much further back from the road and therefore has reduced prominence in the street scene. Consequently, I do not regard those existing developments to justify the appeal scheme or to be a reason to allow harmful development.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the pair of semi-detached houses and the street scene, and so, conflicts with Policy P10 of the CS; saved Policies BD6 and GP5 of the UDP; and the SPD. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) with regards to achieving well designed places.

Other Matters

9. The appellant indicates that the Council may possibly accept other forms of development that they consider would be less practical or desirable, but my assessment is limited to the scheme that is before me.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, the development fails to accord with the relevant policies of the development plan and the Framework. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR