
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2023

by T Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3325375

12 Church Grove, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 5LH

- 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 Albert Solernou against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/02638/FU, dated 25 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is build over existing garage to create 2 storey side extension with dormer to front elevation and rooflight.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has altered from the application form to the decision notice. That on the application form is adequate to describe the proposal and I have considered the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The character and appearance of Church Grove is notably open and airy, the street set in an elevated position above the Aire Valley. Mid and long distance views are available when looking south-west down the street towards tree cover at Horsforth Hall Park and the other side of the valley beyond. These views make a significant positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. There are a number of properties within the street that appear to have had two storey side extensions and there is a mix of property style and form. However, despite being set at the lowest end of the sloping street, No. 11 and the neighbouring No. 12 Church Grove are particularly prominent within the street scene, being located at the head of the cul-de-sac.
6. Therefore, it follows that those views through to the south-west, either side of those properties are also prominent features for those using the street which also provides a pedestrian through link to Hall Park Avenue.

7. The two storey extension proposed, which would be of significant width within the context of the existing dwelling would serve to partially restrict those important views, particularly towards the tree cover.
8. The restriction on views would worsen to a point when travelling down towards the head of the cul-de-sac. However, even accounting for this varying impact due to the topography, this restriction would have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.
9. The extension would not incorporate the existing dormer design to the rear, however the visual impact of this is likely to be limited due to being on the rear with limited viewpoints towards it.
10. The splayed design to the front part of the extension would be a somewhat uncomfortable design feature and one which facilitates an increased width to the extension.
11. However, it is not a form which would be completely new to the street and as a design feature in itself on this limited scale in this particular location, it would not be overly harmful to the appearance of the dwelling or area. The extension would be subordinate through incorporating set downs and set-backs.
12. To conclude therefore, despite these matters, the proposal would have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.
13. The proposal would therefore conflict with policies P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (2019), saved policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) and Policy HDG1 of the SPD¹. Amongst other things, these policies and guidance require proposals of good design that are appropriate to their context and which respect the streets and spaces that make up the public realm and wider locality and respect the character and appearance of the locality.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

14. There is nothing to indicate that the decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

T Burnham

INSPECTOR

¹ Leeds City Council – Householder Design Guide – Supplementary Planning Document – April 2012.