



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2024

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3338916
5 Park Parade, Cross Green, Leeds LS9 8QN

- 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 R Willis against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/05211/FU.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling occupies a prominent position in the street scene, close to the bend in the road where Park Parade joins Pontefract Lane and with an open aspect in particular from that direction due to the positioning of the rear gardens of the adjacent dwellings on Frederick Avenue. The proposed extension would itself be attached to an existing two storey side extension to the dwelling. Prior to that extension being built, the property was a modestly sized semi-detached dwelling. Neither the adjoining dwelling at 7 Park Parade or the identically designed dwellings at 9 and 11 Park Parade have been extended to their side elevations. In that context, the appeal dwelling already appears somewhat visually at odds with the other dwellings in this short section of street scene.
4. The proposed extension would have a width greater than that of the existing two storey side extension and thus would result in a further significantly sized addition to the original dwelling. Whilst it would incorporate a setback from the front elevation of the existing extension and a set down from its ridge, cumulatively it would result in substantial additions to the side of the host dwelling having taken place. This would create a dominant and visually incongruous set of additions which would have little design coherence in relation to the original host dwelling, the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which it is part, or the street scene. Collectively there would also be a failure to achieve any degree of subserviency to the original dwelling. The proposal would for these reasons result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

5. The appellant refers to two containers as being present on the appeal site, one of which benefits from a Lawful Development Certificate. However, at the time of my visit only one container was present, towards the rear boundary. Whilst visible from Park Parade, by virtue of being set towards the rear of the site and because its height is not overly excessive, it has only a limited impact on the street scene. Therefore, whilst there would be some benefit in its removal owing to the fact that it appears out of place in its residential context, this benefit would not outweigh the harm that would result if the proposed development were to be built. The existing hedges close to the appeal site would not provide any notable screening of the first floor element of the proposed development, nor would the open nature of its ground floor lessen the overall impact it would have.
6. In conclusion, by reason of its size, positioning and attachment to an existing two storey side extension, the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and to the surrounding area. Consequently, it would fail to accord with Policy P10 of the Core Strategy 2019 and Saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Unitary Development Plan 2006, where they seek to safeguard character and appearance. There would also be a conflict with the aims of Policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012 in the same regard, and with the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks to achieve well-designed and beautiful places.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR