
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2016

by C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/16/3158344

42 Vesper Gate Mount, Kirkstall, Leeds LS5 3NN

- 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 Joseph Downing against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/04312/FU, dated 8 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2016.
 - The development was described as 'Single storey extension to front, replacing an already existing brick shed.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension to front at 42 Vesper Gate Mount, Kirkstall, Leeds LS5 3NN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/04312/FU, dated 8 July 2016, and the plans submitted with it entitled Location Plan, Proposed Floor Plans and Proposed Elevations: Elevation 1, Elevation 2 and Elevation 3.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, I noted that the development had been completed.
3. The description of development set out in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. The brick shed which was referred to in the original description of development has now been replaced by the single storey extension to front. The development would therefore more appropriately be described as a single storey extension to front, and I have considered the appeal on that basis since neither of the parties would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me taking this course of action.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a 2 storey semi-detached house located on a bend in the road towards the end of a residential cul-de-sac. Due to the siting and corner position of the appeal property there is no strong building line in this part of the street. Many of the neighbouring houses have porches or brick sheds to the front.
-

6. The single storey extension to the front of the appeal property is constructed in brick with a tiled mono-pitched roof, thereby respecting the materials and form of the main house. The proportions of the main window in the extension reflect the horizontal emphasis of the first floor windows, and the colour and materials of the windows match those above. Although it is the full width of the main house, the simple form and modest height and projection ensure that the extension does not appear disproportionately large in relation to the appeal property.
7. The extension projects no further than the brick shed on the adjoining house and therefore does not appear incongruous in the context of neighbouring development.
8. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the single storey extension to front does not have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. The development therefore accords with the design aims of Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy, Policies BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan and Policy HDG1 of the Leeds Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested conditions which it considers would be appropriate were the appeal to be allowed. As the development has already been carried out, the suggested conditions are not necessary and therefore would not meet the tests set out in paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C L Humphrey

INSPECTOR