



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2024

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3355100

2 Braemar Drive, Garforth, Leeds LS25 2NH

- 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 Blann against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 24/04788/FU, dated 20 August 2024, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2024.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension to existing side extension with roof lights and single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development has changed from that on the application form. Evidence that the change was agreed by the parties has been supplied.
3. It appears from the evidence provided that the side extension has been previously approved, is extant and represents a fallback position. The Council have raised no objections to this portion of the works, so I shall only consider the front extension, as the only part of the application that is in dispute.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the front extension section of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality.

Reasons

5. The host dwelling is a two-storey dwelling on a spacious corner plot, located on the junction of Braemar Drive and New Sturton Lane within an area of mixed dwelling types in a predominately residential area. The appeal property benefits from previous extensions.
6. The key element of the appeal proposal is the erection of a front extension projecting approximately 3m from the existing front elevation, with a width of around 4.4m.
7. The appeal property is set back from the highway and is partially screened by sizable vegetation on the property boundary. The Council considers that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of both the appeal property and the area due to its scale and design.

8. I do share the Council's concerns over the projecting front extension. Although the front of the dwelling is partially screened by vegetation, the side of the front extension would be clearly visible from several nearby viewpoints. It would appear as an incongruous and bulky addition that would fail to blend in with its surroundings and it would be out of character with its surroundings, where features of this scale are uncommon. Furthermore, the character and appearance of the property would change significantly.
9. The siting, design and scale of the proposed extension with its position projecting well beyond the front elevation of the host dwelling would create an incongruous and visually dominant feature, at odds with the simple coherent design of the existing building.
10. For these reasons given, I conclude that the proposed development would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
11. Therefore, I find conflict with policies P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (2019) and saved policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) which, amongst other matters, expects the size, scale, design and layout of development to be appropriate to its context and respect the scale and form of the original building.
12. I also find conflict with the design advice set out in the Householder Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

13. I note the comments of the appellant with regard to the location in terms of the frontage and which road it actually faces. This is a minor point in the overall scheme, and the front elevation is that which contains the front door, and the footpath leading up to it.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons above, and having regard to all matters before me, I conclude that the appeal must be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR