



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2023

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3329923

5 Park Lane, Roundhay, Leeds LS8 2EX

- 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 E McDonnell against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/02982/FU, dated 16 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Roundhay Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Roundhay Conservation Area (the CA) is extensive and contains a number of character areas which unify the area and give it a distinctive identity as a suburb built around a large late Georgian park. The appeal site is within Character Area 5 - West of the Park. This area features high-quality housing of different ages in a verdant landscape setting, with individual properties set back from the road within spacious plots enclosed by mature vegetation above low stone walls.
4. The appeal property is a large two-storey, detached house, possibly dating from the 1930s. It occupies a raised position at the corner of West Park Road with Park Lane. Despite the tall roadside boundary hedge and some overhanging garden trees, the upper floor of the building remains prominent, and would likely be more so when the trees are without leaf. The Roundhay Conservation Area Appraisal identifies the property as one of the "Other Positive Buildings" in the CA. Given it is representative of the character and qualities of the area, I agree.
5. The proposal would entail the construction of a two-storey gable extension on the West Park Road elevation. This elevation currently has a relatively simple architectural composition with an unimposing feature-gable of modest projection, reflecting those found on a number of properties in the vicinity.
6. I am advised that the scale of the proposal has been reduced following a previous refusal by the Council. Whilst its form and detailing would echo the existing gable feature and its height would be slightly lower, the extension would nevertheless still be a significant addition relative to the main property,

both individually, and in combination with a similar recent extension to the rear. Additionally, because of its length and the awkward manner in which it would overlap with the smaller existing gable, the extension would harmfully disrupt the architectural composition of the west elevation, causing the extension to appear as a visually jarring and discordant element. As such, the proposal would not be a sympathetic addition to the host building.

7. These shortcomings would be exacerbated by the proposal's prominent position, where the upper part of the extension would be clearly visible above the boundary hedge, as demonstrated by the visual montages in the appellant's Statement. I am also mindful that the hedge could be reduced in height at any time through normal maintenance, or even removed.
8. The Council has also raised concerns over the effect on a nearby tree. Although the tree in question is not a large specimen, it contributes positively to the verdant qualities of the CA. However, based on the information submitted with the appeal, including results of trial digging, I am satisfied that the extension would not interfere with the Root Protection Area of this tree, or lead to any post-development conflict given the separation distance and size of the tree.
9. Nevertheless, as the proposal would cause a harmful change to the appearance of the host building, it would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the CA as a whole. Whilst the harm to the CA can be classed as less than substantial in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), this is a matter of considerable importance and weight. The largely private benefits that the development would likely bring to the occupiers of the property would not come close to outweighing the harm to the CA.
10. Thus, the proposal fails to satisfy the statutory requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. It is also contrary to parts 12 and 16 of the Framework; Policies P10, P11 and P12 of the Leeds Core Strategy (Selective Review 2019) (CS); Saved Policies GP5, BD6 and N19 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) (UDP); and Policy HDG1 of the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012). Taken collectively, these seek to secure high quality design, conserve and enhance the historic environment, and ensure that alterations and extensions respect the scale, form, proportions and character and appearance of the original building.
11. However, as there would be no harm to trees, I find no conflict with Policy G9 of the CS; Saved Policy N20 of the UDP; and Policy LAND2 of the Leeds Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document (2010).

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with statutory requirements and the development plan taken as a whole, and there are no material considerations which outweigh that conflict. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR