
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2017

by A Jordan BA Hons MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/17/3174589

4 Marsden Grove, Cross Flatts, Leeds, LS11 7NR

- 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 Scott Smithson against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/01114/FU, dated 10 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single story front/side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single story front/side extension at 4 Marsden Grove, Cross Flatts, Leeds, LS11 7NR in accordance with application ref 17/01114/FU, dated 10 February 2017 and the plans submitted with it and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 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 plan, existing site plan 1 of 4, proposed site plan 3 of 4, proposed elevations and floor plans 4 of 4.
 - 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.

Procedural Matter

2. The development was described by the applicant as a "single storey side extension". This was changed by the Council to a "single story front/side extension". As the Council's description more accurately describes the development, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the amended description.

Main Issue

3. The main issue for the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. 4 Marsden Grove is a semi-detached property which sits in a street of terraced and semi-detached dwellings. Properties on the north side of Marsden Grove have a projecting bay window at ground floor level. Some of these have been

altered with the addition of canopies above the bay window which are of varying width. Others had small canopies above the front door or alterations to fenestration. I also noted that No 20 has an integral garage within a projecting side extension. Therefore, although the properties have a similar appearance, they are not uniform. In the case of the appeal property the canopy above the bay window extends across the front door, unlike its neighbour, and this distorts the symmetry of the pair of semis.

5. The proposal comprises the erection of a single storey side extension with a projecting bay window which mimics the bay window feature on the front elevation of the main dwelling. The front canopy would extend across the frontage of both the existing property and the proposed extension. The Council do not object to the provision of a side extension but have concerns regarding the appearance of the proposed bay window. I accept that the proposal would further unbalance the symmetry of the pair of dwellings by introducing an additional prominent feature at street level. This would lead to further variation in the appearance of dwellings along the road. However, the piecemeal alterations which have previously been carried out have already considerably altered the streetscape, to the extent that symmetry between pairs of dwellings, or the Prominence of the bay window feature are no longer visually consistent elements along the road. In this context the proposal would not appear out of place, and its effect on the character and appearance of the host property and wider area would not be significantly harmful.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not materially harm the character and appearance of the wider area. It would also not significantly harm the appearance of the existing dwelling. It follows that the proposal would not conflict with saved policies GP5, and BD6 of the *Leeds Unitary Development Plan* and Policy P10 of the *Leeds Core Strategy*, or with advice in the *Leeds Householder Design Guide*, which together seek to preserve visual amenity by ensuring development is of an appropriate size, scale and design for its context. It would also comply with the *National Planning Policy Framework* which has similar aims.

Conditions

7. The proposal would not cause harm the character and appearance of the area and accordingly the appeal is allowed. In addition to conditions relating to the period for implementation and the approved plans I also consider it necessary to impose a condition requiring the use of matching materials. This is to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the development.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR