



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 November 2023

by N Kempton BAHons PGDip MA IHBC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3329154

17 Kineholme Drive, Otley, Leeds LS21 3LX

- 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 Mrs Lucinda Pooley against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00298/FU, dated 13 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension and new door to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development is taken from the decision notice rather than the application form in the interests of clarity and brevity- the former description is clearer. Reference to the second application and initial refusal have been omitted on the basis that the description refers to acts of development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a two storey, end of terrace dwelling situated in a cul-de-sac comprising detached and semi-detached dwellings. Located in a suburban residential area, the immediate context is characterised by properties constructed of brick and render. The character of the area is enhanced by areas of open green space and the presence of mature trees, including trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order located just beyond the garden and adjacent to the property boundary.
5. The Council did not object to the proposed new door on the rear elevation. I have considered this element of the proposal and see no reason to take a contrary view. Nonetheless, with the exception of the projecting two storey gables which are integral to the original design of each of the properties in this terrace, extensions and additions are wholly absent from the facades. The proposed extension would be a departure from the established design. It would disrupt the rhythm of this cohesive design and erode the harmony of the group, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the dwelling and of the terrace as a whole.

6. The integral projecting gables characteristic of this terrace, feature architectural details and embellishments intended to increase their prominence. The front extension spans across the façade and projects forward of it. This would subsume the lower section of the projecting gable, diminishing the legibility of this architectural feature and thereby concealing or distorting the original extent of the host building. The size of the extension is further emphasised by the continuous eaves line and uncharacteristically wide window at ground floor, serving the new home office. Furthermore, the positioning of the front door, aligning with the gable end elevation return, would diminish still further the arrangement of forms and openings in which the gable is distinguished.
7. Notwithstanding the reduced scale of the proposed extension compared with the previous scheme, the massing and proportion is out of balance with the host building. The proposed extension would not form a satisfactory composition, rather it would visually dominate the host building.
8. Properties in the cul-de-sac exhibit variety in terms of style, materials and garden layout, including various differing house types and incremental alterations to neighbouring properties. Nonetheless, front extensions are absent in this cul-de-sac. As such, the proposed built form would not relate well to the host property and terrace, and wider street scene.
9. The appellant states that the 'appreciable modern feel' to the proposal will positively contribute to the character of the locality, refreshing the property. However, for the reasons above, the proposed extension serves to create a discordant element in an otherwise coherent, harmonious street scene, where continuity in siting, design, including massing, form, scale and material palette of extensions adds to the distinctiveness of the area.
10. For these reasons, the proposed front extension would be an incongruous addition to the house. It would be contrary to Policy P10 (i) and (iii) of the Leeds Core Strategy 2019, which requires good contextual design, appropriate size, scale and location, that respects and enhances local character and distinctiveness and positively contributes to place-making, as well as Policy BD6 of the Leeds Saved Unitary Development Plan (2006), which requires all alterations and extensions to respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building.
11. Whilst separation distances and the substantial set back from the front boundary in the appeal case are noted, the proposed development would fail to respect the uniformity of the terrace to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the guidance set out in HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide SPD.
12. The proposed development is also in conflict with the guidance on achieving well-designed places contained in chapter 12 of the Framework, which seeks to ensure development is visually attractive, in keeping with its surroundings and maintains a strong sense of place, whilst not discouraging appropriate innovation.

Other Matters

13. The size and scale of the proposed extension would be reduced compared with the previously refused scheme. Whilst this reduction, the consistent material

palette, the size of the remaining garden and retention of the landscape buffer to the front of the property are noted, these factors do not negate the harm identified. Rather, for the reasons given above, the proposed extension would appear incongruous thereby detracting from the character and appearance of the area.

14. Alterations and extensions in the vicinity are noted, but these do not justify the harmful development proposed here. Rather, such examples demonstrate the necessity to raise design aspirations and promote good contextual design.
15. I note the appellant states that adjoining residents support the proposed development. Evidence of such support is not before me, and I note no representations were received by the Council at application stage. Nevertheless, I am bound to assess the proposal against the policies in the Development Plan and I have identified harm to the character and appearance of the area arising from the proposed development. Neighbour support would not in itself outweigh or mitigate this harm.

Conclusion

16. The proposed development is contrary to the development plan when read as a whole and there are no material considerations to indicate that a decision should be taken other than in accordance with that plan.
17. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Kempton

INSPECTOR