



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2023

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3314210

2 Holt Avenue, Adel, Leeds LS16 8DH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant [outline] planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Priyesh Patel against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/05094/FU, dated 22 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension.
-

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 surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached house located prominently at the corner of Holt Avenue with Fir Avenue. The houses within this modern planned residential estate are similarly constructed in a traditional style and materials. This gives the development as a whole a high degree of visual cohesiveness and adds positively to local distinctiveness.
4. The proposed side extension would be constructed on land belonging to the host property, and would not project any closer to the road than the flank elevation of 1 Oak View to the north. Nonetheless, it would still be a highly conspicuous element in the street scene and would be seen to intrude unduly into an area which currently contributes to a sense of openness at the entrance to Fir Avenue. Moreover, its shallow roof pitch would not reflect the steeply pitched roof of the host building and would give the extension a squat appearance that is firmly at odds with the existing form and proportions of the building. The use of matching materials would do little to mitigate the visual impact of the proposal.
5. Thus, despite representing a relatively modest addition, I find that the design and siting of the extension would have a pronounced and entirely unsatisfactory effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene.
6. The appellant refers to an extension that was approved at 10 Rowan Avenue, within the same estate. However, 10 Rowan Avenue is not a corner property and benefits from partial screening by roadside vegetation. There are also

material differences in where the extension is sited on the dwelling. The schemes are not therefore directly comparable, and, in any event, each case must be considered on its individual merits.

7. I have noted the reasons behind the proposal and recognise the benefits it would bring to the occupants, including through provision of a dedicated office space and freeing up bedrooms in the process. Even so, this is not justification for the harm that would be caused.
8. In conclusion, I find that the development would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (amended 2019); saved Policies BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds City Council Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006); and the Council's 'Householder Design Guide' Supplementary Planning Document (2012). Together, these seek to ensure that development is of good design, which respects the scale, form, proportions, and character of the original building and wider locality. The proposal is also contrary to section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework with regards to achieving well designed places.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no other material considerations, including the appellant's personal circumstances, which indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR