

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2016

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/16/3158436

5 Northwood View, Pudsey LS28 9HP

- 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 A Barker against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/04255/FU was refused by notice dated 26 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a porch to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey, semi-detached house situated on a residential cul-de-sac along which dwellings are broadly similar in style, age and general appearance. Along Northwood View, several properties have sheds and detached garages at the front of the main house that are prominent features of the street scene to which No 5 belongs.
 4. The new porch would be single storey and include a dual pitched roof with a gable end facing Northwood View. The walls would be brick and the roof tiled. The proposed addition would extend across about one half of the width of the front elevation and project noticeably forward of the main front wall. In doing so, it would disrupt the predominantly flat front of the existing house and unduly disturb the unassuming, balanced façade of the host building. As a result, the proposed extension would detract from the intrinsic character and appearance of the appeal property.
 5. The existing garages at the front of the properties on each side of No 5 would largely screen the proposal in oblique views from Northwood View, as the appellant's photographs show. The shed at the front of No 5 would do likewise. Nevertheless, the full extent of the new addition would be evident from the highway just in front of the site. In these views, the proposal would appear substantial in built form given its scale, outward projection and the external materials used. It would draw the eye as the only obvious example of a sizeable front porch on properties within the street scene of which No 5 forms
-

- part. As such, I consider that the appeal scheme would be obtrusive and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the local area.
6. Some reliance is placed on the precedents that the appellant considers have been set by developments at other nearby properties notably at 1, 3 and 7 Northwood View. From what I saw, none of these cases are directly comparable in built form to the proposal and in their relationship to the host building and the street scene. Furthermore, few details have been provided of these schemes and so I cannot be sure that their circumstances are the same or are very similar to the proposal. In any event, each development should be considered on its own merits, as I have done. I also acknowledge the plethora of detached outbuildings that are present along Northwood View and that these form part of the character of the area.
 7. If a garage were to be erected in front of No 5 then its visual impact would be greater than the proposal because it would be larger and closer to the road. Even so, it is unclear from the evidence before me whether or not such a building would come forward if planning permission were to be refused in this case. In those circumstances, I attach no more than limited weight to this consideration because I cannot be certain that the erection of a garage at the front of No 5 is a realistic fall back position. I also note that the rear façade of the house, which faces Northwood Mount, would remain unaltered.
 8. Policy HDG1 of the Council's Householder Design Guide (HDG) states that all extensions should respect the scale and character of the main dwelling and the locality. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) also notes that new development should achieve a high standard of design and add to the overall qualities of an area. For the reasons given, the proposal would fail to adhere to these policies.
 9. Against that background, I conclude on the main issue that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. Accordingly, it conflicts with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy, Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review and Policy HDG1 of the HDG. These policies aim to ensure that development achieves good design; resolves detailed planning considerations including amenity; respects the original building; and is resisted where harm is caused to the character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.
 10. In reaching this conclusion, I note the appellant has requested a meeting with the Council to discuss the issues and a potential way forward.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR