



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2023

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3325404

4 Hetton Road, Gipton, Leeds LS8 2RT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Singh against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01865/FU, dated 22 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description in the above banner heading has been taken from the original application form. The decision notice does however include demolition of existing porch which I have had regard to and determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property relates to a semi-detached property located along Hetton Road which is a residential street where residential properties are located along either side of the road. The property forms one half of a pair of properties with No.6 Hetton Road and the surrounding properties also comprise pairs of semi-detached dwellings that are spaced apart from other pairs in a coordinated manner. They are located back from the street with garden areas/parking to the front and sides. The properties along Hetton Road are very similar in terms of size, design, and style and have a very simple and consistent frontage that generally align with one another. There are very limited structures forward of the building line of the dwellings. This cohesive form and appearance contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. As a result of the site location adjacent the road and the uniformed street scene in which it is located particularly the frontage of the dwellings, the proposed development would be highly visible on approaches along Hetton Road. The proposed development would project forward from the front elevation and would be two-storey in height. As a result, the proposed development would interrupt the form and appearance of the building which would compromise the cohesive appearance of the pair of semi-detached

properties and wider street scene appearing as a contrived and obvious addition at odds with other properties.

6. My attention has been drawn to a previous application at No. 20 Hetton Road which related to a two storey and single storey front extension which was approved by the Council under reference 14/03326/FU. I observed onsite the properties nearby including No. 20 and whilst I appreciate the appellants' frustration in relation to this approval, this front addition is very much the only exception along the street and such front extensions are still not characteristic of the locality. It would therefore not justify further development which would break the current highly uniformed street scene along this section of Hetton Road and I have assessed the appeal based on its own merits.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties and surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies P10 and P12 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review, 2019), Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review, 2006 and Guidance contained within the Leeds City Council Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, 2012 which together, amongst other matters, requires new development for buildings and spaces, and alterations to existing, to be based on a thorough contextual analysis and provide good design that is appropriate to its location, scale and function. For the same reasons, the proposed development would also be contrary to the aspirations of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to achieving well-designed places.

Conclusion

8. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated plan conflict. I conclude that the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR