



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2024

**by M Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 5<sup>th</sup> February 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3334962**

**21A Heathfield, Adel, Leeds LS16 6AQ**

- 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 G Newby against the decision of Leeds City Council.
  - The application Ref 23/05186/FU, dated 23 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2023.
  - The development proposed is two storey side extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matters

2. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in December 2023. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been significantly amended. Therefore, I am satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions from the main parties on the revised Framework.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

4. The appeal property forms part of a two storey semi-detached pair situated in a linear row of properties on the western side of Heathfield. In common with other properties on Heathfield, the appeal property is on a large plot and is set back from the road with a garden and driveway to the front. It is constructed in red brick with a tiled hipped roof and features bay windows to the front elevation. There is a large garage extension to the northern side which is of flat roof construction. At the rear of the garage there is a single storey extension with a pitched roof.
5. The site is bounded by the attached property, 21 Heathfield, to the south, which is of similar appearance to the appeal property, and by Heath Cottage, a detached dormer bungalow to the north. The surrounding area is of established residential character featuring detached and semi-detached bungalows and two storey houses, which vary in size and design, and many have been extended. There tend to be generous gaps between properties. Front boundary treatments comprise mature hedges or low walls and fences. There are also

- trees with the gardens of properties and within the grass verges on both sides of the road. Consequently, the area has a spacious and verdant character.
6. The garage would be demolished and replaced by a two storey side extension which would broadly occupy the footprint of the existing structure. The extension would feature a hipped roof which would be set below the existing hip and broadly reflect the roof form of the existing building. It would be constructed in matching materials. The side of the extension would maintain a generous gap to the boundary with Heath Cottage and in this respect it would reflect the spacious character of the area.
  7. Despite the existing garage extension, the host property has retained a sense of balance and symmetry with the attached property, No 21. Being almost as wide as the host property itself, the proposed extension would result in an overly wide addition relative to the existing proportions of the building. It would not accord with the guidance contained in the Leeds City Council Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD), which states that the proportions of the extension should generally not exceed two thirds of the width of the main house. Moreover, the extension would not be set back sufficiently from the front of the existing property which would accentuate the substantial bulk and massing of the proposal relative to the existing building. As a result, the proposal would fail to achieve a subservient relationship to the host property.
  8. In addition, the adverse visual effects of the proposal would be exacerbated by the position of the new window openings to the front elevation, which would be set to one side of the extension. This would create a large expanse of brickwork above the garage door and result in an unbalanced appearance to the front of the extension. I acknowledge that the proposal has been revised in order to seek to overcome the reason for refusal of the previous application, and that the width and depth of the proposed extension have been dictated to some extent by the constraints imposed by the existing single storey rear extension. I also accept that there is some variation in the sizes and styles of properties on this road. Nevertheless, I find that the scale, massing and detailed design of the proposal would result in a dominant and incongruous addition to the host property to the detriment of the street scene.
  9. The appellant has referred to other two storey side extensions approved in the area, including 21 Farrar Lane, which exceed the two thirds width guidance in the SPD. However, I do not have the substantive details of these cases before me to enable me to draw any comparisons with the appeal proposal, and each inevitably has specific design considerations and surrounding contexts. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
  10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would thus conflict with saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan 2006, Policies P10 and P12 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy 2019, and Policy HDG1 of the SPD. Amongst other things, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that extensions are of an appropriate scale, form and design to the existing building and the wider context. The proposal would also conflict with the Framework, where this seeks to ensure that development is well-designed and sympathetic to local character.

### **Other Matters**

11. The proposal would provide enlarged accommodation within the property for the benefit of the occupiers. However, this would be at the expense of the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area. Therefore, this consideration does not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

### **Conclusion**

12. The proposal does not accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*M Ollerenshaw*

INSPECTOR