



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2023

by M Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3324604

5 Meadow Walk, Chapeltown, Leeds LS7 4RN

- 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 Dr Praveen Prabhakar against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01603/FU, dated 10 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as '1st floor extension over existing ground floor'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling located on a cul-de-sac to the north of Gledhow Park Grove within a residential area. The appeal property is set off the main road running through the estate and includes a single storey projection to the front elevation and a single storey extension to the northern side which also projects forward of the main body of the dwelling.
4. The appeal property forms part of a modern estate which consists of two-storey detached and semi-detached properties. Whilst there is some variation in the design of dwellings, defining features of the properties include the two-storey front gables and commonality of materials comprising red brick, render and concrete roof tiles. The detached properties are of similar proportions in terms of height, width and depth. Their gardens are well landscaped and there are several nearby mature trees, including those to the north of the appeal site. The area therefore has a harmonious and verdant appearance which contributes positively to its character.
5. The proposed first floor extension would be erected above the footprint of existing single storey extension to the northern side of the property. It would extend forward of the main body of the appeal property with a front gable end the ridge of which would be set slightly below the main ridge of the property, and be constructed in materials to match the existing.
6. The appeal proposal would be a substantial addition to the property. It would be of significant height and extend across the full width of the existing side

extension. Whilst the proposed front gable would reflect the roof designs of neighbouring properties, its overall scale would be significantly larger.

7. Although the existing side extension projects forward of the dwelling, owing to its single storey height it has a relatively modest appearance. In contrast, the presence of the appeal proposal forward of the host property would be emphasised by its significant height. The overall result would be an overly large and bulky extension that would be a disproportionate addition and fail to achieve subservience to the host property. The proposal would therefore be at odds with the prevailing character of development on this cul-de-sac, particularly in relation to its siting, scale and design, with a consequent harmful effect on the street scene.
8. Given the location of the appeal property and its orientation relative to the cul-de-sac, the proposal would not be highly prominent. However, due to its height and because of the way that it would project well forward of the property the proposal would still be visible from the driveway running through the estate. From here it would appear as a dominant addition and the resultant building would be excessively large in comparison to other dwellings on the estate. Therefore, it would detract from the established character of the area.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would conflict with saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006), Policies P10 and P12 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (2019), and Policy HDG1 of the Leeds City Council Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that alterations are of an appropriate scale and design to the existing building and the wider context. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure that development is well-designed and sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

10. Neighbouring occupiers have raised other concerns with the proposal, including its effects on their living conditions and on nearby protected trees. As I am dismissing the appeal for the reasons set out above, there is no need for me to consider these matters further.
11. I note the appellant's desire to create improved living space within the property. However, in the form proposed this would be at the expense of the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area. Therefore, this consideration does not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

12. The proposal does not accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this.
13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR