

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2016

by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/16/3160579

8 Glenlea Close, Stanningley, Pudsey, Leeds LS28 6QH

- 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 and Mrs Northfield against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/04091/FU, dated 27 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension to the side and single storey to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey extension to the side and single storey to the rear at 8 Glenlea Close, Stanningley, Pudsey, Leeds LS28 6QH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/04091/FU, dated 27 June 2016, 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 the following approved plans: Site Location/Block Plan Job No 7918; Existing Plans / Elevations Dwg No 7918/01; and Proposed Plans / Elevation Dwg No 7918/02B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling, located in an area that comprises mainly semi-detached dwellings with the same design. The proposed two storey side extension would be of a modest width, and would be set in about 1m from the common boundary with No 10. Although the ground floor would be flush with the front elevation, the first floor would be set back by approximately 1m. Whilst this would not fully comply with the guidance found in the *Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (adopted April 2012)* (HDG), together with the roof design, it would be sufficient to
-

ensure that the extension would appear as a subordinate addition to the host property.

4. I observed during my site visit that a number of other houses along this side of the road had either single or two storey side extensions. On all these the ground floor element was flush with the front elevation, and those which were two storey had the first floor set back, as is proposed in the appeal scheme. I note that the Council have indicated that these pre-date the adoption of the HDG. However, in my opinion, these extensions still appeared sub-ordinate, and do not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of either the host property, or the area. Similarly, despite the houses in the area having relatively flat front elevations, I am satisfied that the staggered front elevation created by the extension would not make it appear as an incongruous or unsympathetic addition to the host property, and would not be detrimental to the street scene.
5. The front elevation would have a door to a storage area on the ground floor. Although not as wide, its appearance would be similar to a garage door, and so would not appear out of keeping. In addition the ratio of openings to brick work would be consistent with the rest of the host property.
6. The Council have raised no objections to the proposed single storey rear extension. This would not be visible from the road, and I am satisfied that it would not be detrimental to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. As such, I agree with their conclusion in this regard.
7. Consequently, I consider that the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As a result there would be no conflict with Policy P10 of the *Leeds Core Strategy (adopted November 2014)* and Policies GP5 and BD6 of the *Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) (adopted July 2006)* which seek to ensure that developments respect the character and appearance of the area, resolve detailed design considerations, and respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building.

Other Matters

8. Whilst the extension would be built on land that forms part of the drive of the house, the dwelling has off-street parking at the front as well. As such the proposal would not necessarily result in an increase in demand for on-street parking in the area. In addition any additional parking and disturbance during the construction of the extension would only be for a limited period of time.
9. The windows on the proposed extension would be located on the front and rear elevations. Given the distances to the nearby houses, I am satisfied that no loss of privacy would occur.

Conclusion and Conditions

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.
11. In addition to the standard implementation condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to control the external appearance of the building. The Planning Practice Guidance indicates that removal of permitted development rights should only

be done in exceptional circumstances. Given that the General Permitted Development Order restricts windows that can be inserted in side elevations under permitted development rights, I am not persuaded that the condition suggested by the Council in this regard would be necessary.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR