
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2016

by Philip Major BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 4th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/16/3160030
5 Barfield Crescent, Leeds LS17 8RU.

- 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 Kunal Shori against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref: 16/02858/FU, dated 30 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to the front of the garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension to the front of the garage at 5 Barfield Crescent, Leeds LS17 8RU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 16/02858/FU, dated 30 April 2016, and the plans submitted with it.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The area around the appeal property is characterised by the large number of differing house designs, styles and sizes. The materials used to construct and finish the dwellings is also wide ranging, with brickwork being by no means the only wall finish. I noted many examples of white painted render as well as timber or uPVC cladding. There are also many white garage doors made of various materials. The area as a whole is therefore varied and exhibits no definitive theme in relation to external appearance.
4. In this context the extension at the appeal property is not especially prominent. It has already been constructed and the uPVC cladding is similar to cladding used elsewhere nearby. It also matches the cladding on the front of the dwelling. There is some filtering of views of the house by vegetation, and the extension does not stand out as a discordant feature, especially as it is recessed behind the front wall of the house.
5. I also note that the extension has in part disguised the otherwise monolithic extension at the side of the dwelling, and in my judgement this is likely to have brought some visual benefit. For these reasons I do not consider that the extension has a materially detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the street scene. As a result I find no conflict with the policies of the

development plan brought to my attention (Core Strategy Policy P10 and saved Unitary Development Plan Policies GP5 and BD6) or with the Householder Design Guide. Amongst other things these policies and guidance seek to ensure that development is acceptable in its context, and I have found that the development is acceptable in this regard.

6. Although the Council has suggested that it would be appropriate to impose conditions on any grant of planning permission, in this instance as the development has already been carried out, it is not necessary that conditions are imposed.
7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Major

INSPECTOR