



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3359684

1 Holt Park Green, Adel, Leeds, LS16 7RE

- 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 Alastair Smith against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/06495/FU.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension to front of dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for proposed single storey extension to front of dwelling at 1 Holt Park Green, Adel, Leeds, LS16 7RE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/06495/FU, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings: Site Location Plan and Proposed Plans Drawing No. RAS/HPG/02.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a two-storey detached house on the corner of Holt Park Approach and Holt Park Green. It is well screened by a high conifer hedge that is planted along the boundary adjacent to the footpath. Surrounding houses within the estate comprise a varied mixture of types and designs, which complement each other in terms of age, materials and appearance, albeit with many having been altered over time.
4. It is proposed to convert the existing integral garage into an ensuite bathroom and store, and to construct a single storey lean to extension to the front of the dwelling to create an additional bedroom and sitting room at ground floor level.
5. The existing dwelling has an L shaped footprint, and the proposed extension would infill the existing gap, and square up the footprint. The extension would not project beyond the existing front and side elevations of the original L shape. The proposed lean to roof over the extension would be lower than that of the existing catslide roof to the front of the dwelling, and would sit below the existing horizontal first

floor windows, with the existing vertical window being reduced in height. The external materials of the extension would match those used in the existing dwelling and although the windows would not match those above, I note that the existing dwelling and others in this area are asymmetrical. The relocation of the front door would add detail to an existing large expanse of blank brickwork, which would enhance the appearance of the dwelling to the front. Sufficient space would be retained to park two cars in front of the extension on the existing driveway.

6. I acknowledge that the existing dwelling matches those at numbers 3 and 5 Holt Park Green. However, the cul-de-sac and the wider housing estate comprise a mixture of house types and designs and is not of uniformed appearance. Accordingly, the proposed alterations would not be materially harmful.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed alterations and extensions to the dwelling would respect the design of the original dwelling, would be subservient to it, and would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policy P10 of the Core Strategy Review 2019, Policy BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (review 2006) (the UDP), Policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) or the National Planning Policy Framework. Collectively these policies and guidance seek to ensure that alterations and extensions respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building and that development is appropriate to its context and respects the character and quality of its surroundings.
8. Whilst Policy GP5 of the UDP appears to relate to larger scale developments, with Policy BD6 being more specific to alterations and extensions, I find no conflict with this.

Conditions

9. I have imposed the standard time limit condition and a condition listing the approved drawings for the avoidance of doubt. A condition to ensure the external materials match those of the existing house is also necessary to ensure that the development does not harm the appearance of the host dwelling or its surroundings.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Bartlett

INSPECTOR