



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 May 2024

by C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3338094

41 Hall Park Avenue, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 5LR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Phil Kane against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/06624/FU.
 - The development proposed is to raise existing roof and convert loft to habitable space with side dormer and additional roof lights. 2 storey side extension over the garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The site is located in a suburban residential area comprised of a mix of detached two-storey and semi-detached dormer properties built as part of a comprehensive development with front parking/gardens. The appeal site slopes gently and at present the roofline of the property sits slightly below both 43 and 39 Hall Park Avenue. The appeal site is located across the junction to Hall Park Close, at the bottom of a slope and therefore is highly visible within the wider street scene.
4. The host property is a gable fronted detached dwelling which has previously been altered through a pitched roof porch and single storey side/rear extension. The property is a mix of render with some brick detailing and has a tall chimney. The roof pitches of the existing extensions match those of the main host building providing symmetry to its appearance. The width and height of the property, arrangement of rooflines, fenestration and use of different materials give the property a well-balanced, proportionate appearance. The style of the host property is repeated elsewhere in the wider street scene.
5. The pattern of the wider street scene reflects the sloping topography of the land. Rather than gradually stepping downwards, the height of rooflines are staggered which creates a distinctive roof scape. There is variety in the style of the properties, which is accentuated by the presence of some modest alterations. Nevertheless, there remains a regularity in the pattern of styles through their rooflines, orientation, materials and the spaces between them, which provides a sense of rhythm to the appearance of the street scene.

6. The proposal seeks to extend the property by raising the existing ridge and eave height by 1.25m, the insertion of a side dormer and side extension over the garage. Despite the use of similar materials to the existing, the cumulative effects of the proposed changes would have an overbearing impact on the appearance of the host property. The proposed increase in height, width, dormer and additional window openings would alter the balanced proportions of the property resulting in an overly bulky appearance which would dominate the original character of the host property.
7. The proposed additions to create a three-storey property with a higher roof height would appear discordant alongside the neighbouring two-storey properties and disrupt the visual rhythm and pattern of the wider street scene and its roofscape, given its prominent location opposite Hall Park Close.
8. I note the appellant references changes to No 43 which has an extended roof design, however it retains the proportions and appearance of a two-storey dwelling. I have therefore assessed the proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
9. For the reasons outlined the proposed alterations would harm the character and appearance of both the host building and the wider street scene. As such the proposal conflicts with policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review) 2006 and policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012. The policies require extensions to be of good design that respect the form, proportions and detailing of the original build and are appropriate to their location.
10. The proposal would also be contrary to the requirements for good design set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, on this basis the presumption in favour of sustainable development would not apply to the proposal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons outlined above the appeal is dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR