



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2024

**by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 16<sup>th</sup> January 2024**

**Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3332248**

**34 Kineholme Drive, Otley LS21 3LX**

- 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 Nichola Bedford against the decision of Leeds City Council.
- The application Ref 23/04829/FU, dated 3 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2023.
- The development proposed is a single-storey front extension.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matter

2. On 19 December 2023, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, as any policies in the Framework that are material to this decision have not fundamentally changed, I am satisfied that this has not prejudiced any party and I have had regard to the latest version in reaching my Decision.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

## Reasons

4. The houses in Kineholme Drive are arranged in two distinct forms, either as terraces or semi-detached pairs. The consistency in appearance and layout of the buildings gives Kineholme Drive a strong cohesive character.
5. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling and is typical of the prevailing character. The building has an unaltered frontage and retains its original form and symmetry. Full-height gables at each end of the terrace are a distinctive design feature and key component of the symmetry found in the terraces.
6. Together, Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (amended 2019) (the CS); saved Policies BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds City Council Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) (the UDP); Policy BE11 of the Otley Neighbourhood Plan (2018-2028) (the NP); and Policy HDG1 of the Council's 'Householder Design Guide' Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD), seek to ensure that development is of good design which, amongst other things, respects the scale, form, proportions, and character of the original building and wider locality. In addition, paragraph 135 of the Framework seeks developments that are visually attractive as a result of good

architecture and layout; sympathetic to local character; and add to the overall quality of the area.

7. Although the proposed single-storey extension would be a relatively modest addition to the building, it would nonetheless be a highly prominent and disruptive element. Its significant projection beyond the front of the building and the awkward manner in which it would cut across the front gable, would diminish the gable as a distinctive feature and upset the overall balance and symmetry of the front of the terrace as a whole. The result is a development which would not integrate sensitively with the host building and its immediate surroundings.
8. I have taken account of other existing front extensions in the area, but they are firmly in the minority and therefore have only a limited influence on the character and appearance of the area surrounding the appeal site. Moreover, there are no other forward extensions on this terrace.
9. I therefore conclude that the development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area, and so, is contrary to the design, character, and appearance requirements of Policy P10 of the CS, Policies BD6 and GP5 of the UDP, Policy BE11 of the NP, Policy HDG1 of the SPD, and the Framework.

### **Other Matters**

10. The private benefits that the proposal may bring to the current occupiers of the property and other visiting family members are noted, but do not override the harm that I have identified, which would remain after these personal reasons cease to be material.

### **Conclusion**

11. The proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the appellant's personal circumstances, which indicate that the decision should be made otherwise. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

*A Caines*

INSPECTOR