



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 March 2024

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3335005

122 Hetton Road, Gipton, Leeds LS8 3AE

- 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 Mrs Sangeeta Sharma against the decision of Leeds City Council.
- The application Ref is 23/05324/FU.
- The development proposed is retrospective application for a two storey extension to the front.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The extension is in situ, and I am consequently dealing with the application retrospectively. Since the appeal has been lodged the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) (December 2023) has been published. Its provisions in relation to the main issue in dispute are similar and I am therefore satisfied that no party has been prejudiced by its publication.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the street scene within Hetton Road.

Reasons

4. Hetton Road is characterised by two-storey semi-detached properties. There are a small number of house types that are repeated creating a sense of rhythm and cohesion within the street. In this regard, the appeal premises, and its attached, form part of a group of properties between No's 108 and 142 Hetton Road that consist of the same house type.
5. There have been numerous alterations to these properties within this group, such as hip to gable roof alterations, porches, and canopies. These have weakened the original balance of the respective pairs of semi-detached houses, and thus their original consistency in the street scene. This includes the pair of properties incorporating the appeal premises. Despite this, the group of properties retain some repeated features that bring cohesion to the group and contribute positively to the street scene.
6. One such feature are steeply tiled slopes at the first floor above the front entrance doors. Other than the appeal premises, these are found, largely intact, on all but one property in the group between No's 108 and 142 Hetton Road. The attached property to the appeal premises retains a tiled feature, albeit not in its original form. However, the two-storey extension subject of this

appeal has entirely removed this feature resulting in a second property within the group to lose this element. As such, the development has further eroded the surviving consistency within this group of semi-detached properties to the detriment of the street scene.

7. The ground floor alterations in the development before me do not appear at odds with the street scene given the nature of the numerous other extensions and alterations to properties, including the attached neighbouring dwelling and the previous porch in situ. However, the absence of harm in relation to this element of the development does not outweigh my findings of harm from the loss of the steep tiled slope at the first floor.
8. I therefore find that the development has a harmful effect on the street scene within Hetton Road. As such, I find conflict with the requirements of Policy P10 of the Council's Core Strategy, Policies GP5 and BD6 of its Unitary Development Plan, the guidance in its Householder Design Guide and the provisions of the Framework, when taken together and in so far as they relate to this matter. These say, amongst other things, that new development for buildings and spaces, and alterations to existing, should be based on a thorough contextual analysis and provide good design that is appropriate to its location, scale and function.
9. No objections were raised from occupants of neighbouring properties. However, this, or concerns regarding the processing of the application, do not alter the effects of the development before me on the street scene. Moreover, the personal circumstances of the appellant, including the personal need for the development, carries limited weight and does not outweigh my findings of harm in relation to the main issue.
10. The development conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole, and there are no material considerations that indicate that the appeal decision should be taken other than in accordance with it.
11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters before me, the appeal is dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR