



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2023

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3311112

6 Greenbanks Drive, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 5BH

- 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 Mrs Alison Murfin against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/04854/FU, dated 6 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2022.
 - The development proposed was originally described as demolition of existing conservatory. Re-fenestration of existing house - render externally to first floor. Re-modelled bay window to front elevation. Raising of the ridge height & loft conversion. Single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - Highway safety in Greenbanks Drive with particular reference to parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling located within a street characterised by detached two-storey houses and bungalows. The proposed ground floor extensions would wrap around the front, side and rear and would be finished with brick and a flat roof. The extent of brickwork, particularly above the windows and garage door on the front, combined with the contrasting materials to the rendered first floor would create an unduly dominant addition to the front. This stark contrast would not harmonise, or tie in, with the upper floors of the dwelling and the more muted recessive tones of the render.
4. The appellant has referred me to other front projections within the street. However, these did not share the same design characteristics as the appeal proposal and my concerns are not the principle of a forward extension, but the form and appearance of the proposed design as set out above.
5. The proposal would also involve a large box like dormer on the roof. By raising the ridgeline, and subsuming most of the roof slope, the dormer would result in a top-heavy addition. The height of the resulting dormer, and the vertical proportions of the bedroom windows, would be at odds with the horizontal

emphasis of the windows at the first floor. This would leave the first floor appearing somewhat squat between the large ground floor addition and the bulky dormer.

6. The flat roof dormers that I have been referred to by the appellant, although visible from the street, did not subsume the roof slope to the extent that the appeal proposal would. I accept that permitted development rights allow for alterations to roof slopes, including the additions of dormers. However, the proposals seek a dormer that requires planning permission by raising the ridgeline. As such, the extent of any permitted rights does not outweigh the harm I have identified from the proposals before me.
7. The proposed dormer would not be a prominent feature in the street scene, but it would be seen in private views from the rear. The proposed increase of height from the front would result in a steeper roof slope pitch and the loss of a chimney stack. Taken together, with the increase in height, these elements would incrementally erode the consistency in design with the adjacent neighbouring property. The neighbouring property is on a higher level and given the mix of house styles in the street I do not consider these matters to be determinative. Nonetheless, they do add to the harm I have identified from the other elements of the design.
8. To conclude, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I therefore find conflict with the requirements of Policy P10 of the Council's Core Strategy (CS), Policies GP5 and BD6 of its Unitary Development Plan, Policy HDG1 of its Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, when taken together. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that alterations are of an appropriate scale and design to the existing building and the wider context.

Highway safety

9. The loss of the existing garage would mean that it is not available for the parking of vehicles. This would leave one single parking space within the front grounds of the host property. The loss of a potential parking space, and the provision of one space, is below the Council's guidelines that seek two spaces.
10. I have no firm details of any specific highway safety concern from existing on-street parking in the vicinity of the appeal site. Moreover, the appellant has indicated that there would be space within the grounds to provide an additional parking space and this could be secured by way of a condition were I minded to allow the scheme. This would mean there would be no net loss of off-street parking spaces in any case.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable effect on highway safety in Greenbanks Drive with regards to car parking. As such, I find no conflict with the requirements of Policy T2 of the CS, which says, amongst other things that parking provision will be required for cars, motorcycles and cycles in accordance with current guidelines.

Other Matters

12. I note that the appellant was willing to make changes to the scheme with the view to finding a solution. However, concerns regarding the processing of the application, are not issues that I can assess as part of this appeal. I accept that

the appellant is seeking to improve the living conditions of the property. However, personal circumstances will seldom outweigh more general planning concerns and I must determine the appeal based on the merits of the scheme before me. Such matters, and the absence of harm in relation to other considerations, do not outweigh my concerns relating to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. To conclude, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable effect on highway safety in Greenbanks Drive with regards to car parking. However, it would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
14. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR