



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2024 by T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Anne Jordan BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3332460

3 Moor Top, Drighlington, Bradford, BD11 1BX

- 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 Scott Keegan against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/04723/FU, dated 28 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 25 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is part front single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. Since the determination of this application, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 20 December 2023. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I consider that there is no requirement for me to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site forms part of a small cluster of dwellings on Moor Top, set back behind 1b Moor Top and angled away from the road. Whilst there is a variety of dwelling types, sizes and materials, front extensions to properties are not a prevailing characteristic. On the western side of Moor Top is an industrial complex, on the southern side is a modern residential development and to the east is open space, this makes the appeal property prominent in both short and long range views.
6. The appeal property is a detached stone fronted property with steps up to the ground floor. It is well proportioned, and the symmetrical, appearance of the front elevation is an attractive feature of the dwelling. Owing to the open space at the side of the property, combined with its elevated position, it is highly

visible and distinctive, contributing positively to the character and appearance of the area.

7. The proposed single storey extension would comprise a pitched roof extension constructed in glass and stone which would be located in front of one of the ground floor windows. Due to its, size, position, and the height of the pitched roof it would detrimentally unbalance the original symmetry and proportions of the host dwelling. I note that the extension would utilise materials matching the host property and would incorporate a large amount of glazing. However, the proposal would remove a substantial proportion of the original stone frontage and in this context, the introduction of a large open glazed area in the principal elevation would appear particularly incongruous. In this regard the use of glazing would not minimise the impact of the proposal or offset the harm to the appearance of the front façade. Instead, it would appear as a visually prominent and discordant addition, detracting from the existing simple form of the building's front elevation. The harm would be exacerbated by the prominent, elevated position of the host property, where the proposal would be highly visible in views into the site and alongside surrounding properties where front extensions are not a common feature.
8. In coming to this view, I have been mindful of the guidance on front extensions contained in the Leeds Householder Design Guide (2012) (SPD). This sets out that single storey front extensions may be acceptable where there is a lack of uniformity within the streetscene, where the proposal will not harm the character of the locality and where the house is set well back from the boundary. However, this is guidance only and the word *may* indicates an element of discretion depending on the site context.
9. As I have already set out, while I acknowledge the variety of dwelling types, sizes, and materials on the street, a consistent feature is the lack of front extensions. Therefore, the proposed extension would be out of character with both the host property and the wider locality. Furthermore, while the site plan shows the property set back from the front boundary, on my site visit I observed a track running along the curtilage close to the front of the property, with a low stone boundary wall positioned close to the front elevation. The proposal would be sited close to this boundary wall with minimal separation, which further adds to the prominence of the proposal. I therefore find that it would conflict with the SPD guidance in relation to front extensions.
10. For the reasons set out above, the proposed single storey front extension would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. It would therefore conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (amended 2019); saved Policies BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds City Council Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006). These, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development is of good design, appropriate to its location and respectful of the form of the original dwelling. It would also conflict with Policy HDG1 of the SPD which requires extensions to respect the scale, form, proportions and character and appearance of the area and main dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

T Bennett

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR