The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2023

by H Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3316135
11 Springhead Road, Rothwell, Leeds LS26 0EX

- 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 Roger Cockerham against the decision of Leeds City Council.
- The application Ref 22/07133/FU, dated 22 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2022.
- The development proposed is front extension to the lounge.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I note that a revised proposal for a front extension was sent to the Council for pre application advice. This revised scheme is not before me, and I have not therefore had regard to it in determining this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of 11 Springhead Road and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The host dwelling is a detached bungalow of a similar design to No 13 and 15 Springhead Road. The street has a mix of dwelling types and styles, with mainly bungalows on the same side of the street and two storey dwellings opposite. The bungalow is set back from the road behind a low wall and landscaped area and is at a higher level than the road.

5. Whilst the proposed extension would fill in a recessed area to the front of the dwelling and would not protrude further forward than the existing dwelling, the resultant form of the gable roof would not reflect the slope of the existing roof. The apex of the extended roof would not be central to the building, giving an asymmetrical appearance to the building. This would unbalance the dwelling and have a discordant and jarring appearance in the streetscene reducing the contribution the dwelling makes to the character of the area.

6. My attention has been drawn to a front extension to a property in the vicinity of the appeal site. This is a single storey extension to the front of a two storey dwelling so is not comparable to the proposal before me. The photograph of the bungalow shows a property of a different design to the appeal proposal. In any event, I have determined this appeal on the site-specific circumstances of this case.

7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of 11 Springhead Road and the surrounding area and conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (2019) and Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) which together, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development is appropriate to its context and respects the character and quality of the surrounding area. It would also conflict with Policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) which states that additions should respect the character and appearance of the locality particularly the roof form and roof line. It would also be at odds with the overarching design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

8. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

H Senior

INSPECTOR