



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2025

by **C Mayes CMLI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3357463

62 Cookridge Avenue, Cookridge, Leeds LS16 7LZ

- 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 Jed Field against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/05765/FU.
 - The development proposed is wrap around ground floor extension, first floor/roof extension, front extension and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Part of the second reason for refusal in the Council's decision notice envisages the potential subdivision of the appeal property into 2 units. This is not described on the application form and subdivision of the dwelling is plainly not part of the proposed development. As such, I have not included the matter in my assessment of the appeal.
3. The appellant has submitted a revised plan as part of the appeal process that amends the proposed internal first floor layout of the development. The revised plan removes a single wall to combine the previously shown guestroom and home office into a single home office space. The appellant has asked me to consider the revised plan (No 003) as part of the appeal. However, the revised internal arrangements make no difference to the main issues of the appeal so I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans submitted with the application.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the property and wider area;
 - the living conditions of the occupants of the property, with regard to outlook and access to light; and,
 - parking and highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal property forms half of a pair of semi-detached bungalows. It is largely unaltered and is typical of development in the surrounding area. Each pair of

bungalows in the locality is similar in appearance and well-spaced from the next. The bungalows have modest gardens to the front with longer gardens to the rear. The front gardens are predominantly divided from the street by low brick walls. Houses on the opposite side of the street are predominantly semi-detached dormer bungalows of similar scale, materials and proportion and are also sited within open-fronted plots. These characteristics, along with the broad width of the road, combine to give the street scene a strong rhythm and an ordered, spacious feel.

6. The property neighbouring the appeal site, No 64, is a two-storey, detached house built from stone. On the opposite side of the road from No 64 is another two-storey detached house. While these 2 houses depart from the general characteristics of the street, they stand at the end of the street and do not interrupt the strong pattern and low-rise character of development beyond.
7. The proposed development would extend the appeal property to the side and rear and add an entrance porch to the front. The proposed side extension would have a hipped roof but nonetheless it would substantially project to the side of the appeal property. As a result, it would disrupt the balanced appearance of the pair of semi-detached bungalows. In addition, the side extension would occupy most of the space between the host building and No 64 and so it would significantly reduce the visual separation between them. Given the difference between the 2 buildings in terms of form, scale, height and materials the result would be a disharmonious juxtaposition. Furthermore, the reduction in separation between the 2 would result in a cramped appearance at odds with the spacious feel of the locality.
8. The proposal would introduce a significant number of rooflights onto the property. The appellant explains that these would provide adequate living conditions for occupants while protecting the privacy of neighbouring residents. While rooflights are commonly found in residential areas, they tend to be limited to 1 rooflight on each roof plane. As such, the number of proposed rooflights would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
9. The proposed rear extension would terminate with a gable end. While this would, in part reflect the existing gabled projection to the front of the property, the ridgeline of the proposed extension would be similar in height to that on the roof of the main part of the bungalow. The rear extension would also be wider and so it would be a substantial and disproportionate addition that would dominate the back of the building. The rear addition would not be visible from the street, but it would be seen from adjacent properties, and it would appear at odds with the predominant character of the surrounding area.
10. The appellant sets out a fallback position whereby the appeal property benefits from full permitted development rights. The appellant has provided plans that indicate the potential effect of the property being extended at ground floor level, through the replacement of the existing hipped roof to form a gable end to the side and the addition of a dormer window.
11. There is a greater than theoretical possibility of this development being implemented if this appeal is dismissed and so the fallback position is a relevant consideration in my assessment. However, from the limited information provided, I am unconvinced that extensions constructed under permitted development rights would cause greater detriment to the visual qualities of the host property and the locality

compared to the appeal proposal. As such, the fallback position does not carry sufficient weight to justify the harm identified above.

12. The appellant states that the proposed development would be similar to other extensions in the local area. However, having regard to the particular effects of the proposal and the context to the appeal property I conclude that the development would result in a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. Hence, it would conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy, September 2019 (the CS), and Policies BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan, reviewed 2006 (the UDP). Among other things, these seek to ensure that development is appropriate to its context and respects the scale, form and detailing of the original building. For the same reasons, I find the proposal would not accord with Policy HDG1 of the Council's Householder Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document, 2012 (the SPD).

Living conditions

13. The proposed development includes the use of rooflights to both ground and first floor accommodation. There would be some rooms that are not served by traditional windows, but the proposed rooflights would be positioned at a height above floor level to allow acceptable views of the outside. Also, they would be positioned and be of a size to allow appropriate levels of daylight and sunlight into the rooms that they serve.
14. Therefore, I conclude the development would have an acceptable effect on living conditions at the appeal property in terms of outlook and access to light. In these regards, it would accord with the UDP Policy GP5, which among other things, seeks to ensure that development avoids problems through loss of amenity.

Parking

15. In keeping with the predominant arrangement of vehicle parking in the surrounding area there is currently space to park 2 vehicles to the side of the appeal property. The proposed development would reduce the available off-street vehicle parking to 1 vehicle.
16. CS Policy T2 states that parking provision will be required for cars in accordance with current standards. No such standards have been provided, but the appellant states that under the terms of the SPD there should generally be 2 parking spaces provided at the appeal property. This is consistent with the comments on parking requirements as set out in the Council officer's report on the planning application leading to this appeal. As such, the development would lead to sub-standard parking provision on the appeal site.
17. However, on my visit I noted some on-street parking in the area. Given the 20mph speed limit and good visibility along the road, this did not appear to result in any risk to highway safety nor inconvenience to other road users. Furthermore, the appeal property is located close to public transport routes that may reduce reliance on car use. The proposed development also includes external storage space into the dwelling suitable for cycle storage. Given these factors, it is highly unlikely the loss of parking at the appeal property would prejudice highway safety or lead to any other adverse effect.

18. Therefore, I conclude the development would not have a harmful effect on parking and highway safety. In these regards, it would accord with UPD Policy GP5 and the aim to maximise highway safety. The proposal would not accord with the requirements of UPD Policy T2 in respect of parking provision but for the reasons given above I find in this instance the policy conflict to be acceptable.

Conclusion

19. The development would be acceptable when considered against the second and third main issues. However, the harm identified in respect of the first main issue means the proposal would conflict with the development plan, when taken as a whole. Material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

C Mayes

INSPECTOR