



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2024 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3344993

50 Lyndon Avenue, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 1DZ

- 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 Philip Smith against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00209/FU.
 - The development proposed is Two storey side 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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is situated on Lyndon Avenue, a residential cul de sac. The appeal property's immediate setting is as part of 5 pairs of two storey semi-detached properties with a chalet-style first floor formed by dormer windows across the semi-detached pair. All ten dwellings are of a similar scale and massing and incorporate consistent design features. The remaining properties surrounding the appeal site are two storey semi-detached properties with gable roofs which are also consistent in their design.
5. The proposed two storey extension would be flush with the existing ridge height of the dwelling, but with the eaves height sitting significantly above the existing. The proposed dormer window to the front would be smaller in scale than the other dormer windows at first floor level and would not align visually.
6. The resultant development would appear as an awkward and bulky addition to the side of the property, which would alter the existing dwelling's character and design. Even though the proposed extension would be set back at the front elevation it would still lack visual subservience to the main dwelling due to the continuation of its ridge height. I recognise that the proposed extension would use appropriate materials to assist in assimilating with the host dwelling, but this would not outweigh the poor response to the original architecture or form of the host building due to the proportions of the additional dormer and the

raising of the eaves height. As a result, the proposal would unacceptably erode the design quality of the area and would appear as an incongruous addition to the main dwelling due to its design.

7. I observed on my site visit another two-storey extension present within the stretch of dormer roof properties on Lyndon Avenue. However, this is comparably smaller in scale and is clearly read as a subservient addition due to its limited width and the presence of a set down from the ridge height of the main property.
8. I have also had regard to the presence of other two storey side extensions in the area albeit that I am satisfied these are not a defining feature of the character of the area. Properties on Lyndon Avenue are largely unaltered to the side with the intervening breaks between the houses creating an open and spacious character which prevents a 'terracing effect'. The proposed two storey extension with its position against the boundary with No.48 would erode this open character.
9. For the reasons as set out, the proposed two storey extension would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. As such it would fail to comply with Policy P10 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) and the Saved Unitary Development Plan Review (2016) policies GP5 and BD6 which require development to be compatible with the host property and the surrounding area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR