



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2024

by R Morgan BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3349965

4 Meynell Court, Colton, LEEDS LS15 9EA

- 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 Peter Kay against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03033/FU.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension to front of house to provide ground floor shower room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modest, two storey house which forms one of a small group of four dwellings on the small cul-de-sac of Meynell Court. Like other properties in the surrounding area, the homes on Meynell Court differ in their individual design, but are of similar age and materials, and are all of a simple, modern style.
4. Although set back from Meynell Road, the group of houses on Meynell Court are clearly visible from the street across a large area of open space. The open character of this area, and the raised position of the properties on Meynell Court, means the homes form prominent features within the street scene. This is particularly the case for the appeal property, which is immediately adjacent to the surfaced footpath which runs through the housing estate. The large, blank side elevation of 4 Meynell Court (No. 4) forms a dominant feature when viewed from the footpath.
5. Planning permission has previously been granted for a modest single storey front extension at the appeal property (ref 22/04859/FU). To overcome practical difficulties with building that scheme, a revised scheme is now proposed. This would be of the same design and appearance as that already permitted, but with a larger forward projection (2.6m compared with the approved 1.9m), and a small increase in height of around 0.15m.
6. Many other houses in the vicinity have extensions or conservatories which are visible from the public domain, and the proposed extension would be seen in this context. However, the proposed addition would be deeper than that of

other front projections on Meynell Court, and its position side-on to the footpath means that the full extent of the proposed extension would be seen from the public domain.

7. Although the additional forward projection would be only 0.7m more than previously approved, this would be enough to make a noticeable difference. Unlike the previously approved scheme, the extension would fail to appear as a modest addition. Rather, the extra bulk at the front of the house would alter the simple proportions of the building.
8. When viewed from the road and footpath, the homes on Meynell Court currently appear as a balanced group, but the proposal would alter this. The extension would appear as an overly large addition at the front of No. 4 which would increase its prominence from the cul-de-sac, footpath and wider public realm. The effect would be particularly significant in relation to the neighbouring bungalow, which is slightly set back from the appeal property. This would detract from the existing character of Meynell Court.
9. As for many of the houses in the surrounding area with single storey elements, the roof pitch of the proposed extension would be shallower than that of the main roof. The pitch difference would be accentuated in the appeal proposal by the longer form of the extension, compared with that previously approved. The discrepancy would be particularly noticeable when viewed from the side of the house, which is its main aspect from the public realm. The result would be to further detract from the original character of the house and cul-de-sac.
10. The very slight increase in height of the extension would result in the existing soldier course detailing under the upper windows being partially obscured. This brick feature is characteristic of many houses in this area, and would be replicated on the ground floor windows of the proposed extension. The partial loss of this feature is not, in itself, sufficient to dismiss the scheme, but would add to the harm to the character of the house.
11. Even when the approved scheme is taken into account, the proposed front extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of both the original house and the wider area. The proposal would conflict with Policy 10 of the Core Strategy (amended 2019), which requires that the size, scale and layout of development respects the character and quality of the external spaces and wider locality. It would also fail to comply with Saved Policy BD6 of the Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP), which states that extensions should respect the scale, form and detailing of the original building. As it has not resolved detailed matters of design, there would also be conflict with UDP Policy GP5.
12. The scheme would also fail to comply with Policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, which requires that all extensions respect the scale, form, proportions and character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.

Other Matters

13. I note that the proposal would provide a ground floor bathroom large enough to meet the appellant's care needs, whilst avoiding the practical problems involved with the implementing the approved scheme. However, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed scheme is the only way to achieve this,

or that no other options exist which would avoid the harm to the character of the host dwelling and the wider area.

14. The appeal site is close to the boundary of the Colton Conservation Area (CA), but the proposed extension would be seen in the context of surrounding modern development and public open space. Whilst I am satisfied that the proposal would not cause harm to the setting of the CA, this does not outweigh the other harms which I have identified.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the development plan, and no other material considerations would outweigh this harm. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR