



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2017

by Elaine Gray MA(Hons) MSc IHBC

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

Decision date: 25 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/17/3180221

24 Norwood Crescent, Stanningley, Pudsey LS28 6NG

- 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 Gareth Solk against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/02754/FU, dated 8 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 27 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as 'part single/part two storey side/rear extension. Proposed porch'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single/part two storey side/rear extension and porch at 24 Norwood Crescent, Stanningley, Pudsey LS28 6NG in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 17/02754/FU dated 8 February 2017, 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: Location plan; M2542.04.101; M2542.04.102 A; M2542.04.103 A; M2542.04.202; M2542.04.203; M2542.04.204; M2542.04.302; M2542.04 201 A; M2542.04.202 A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey house located on a corner site within a predominantly residential area. Planning permission¹ has been granted for a scheme including a two storey side extension which would be of comparable dimensions to the proposal before me. The proposed front porch and rear extension are not in contention, and so my consideration will focus on the effect of the proposal single storey element.

¹ 17/00805/FU

4. The Council's document entitled 'Leeds Local Development Framework – Householder Design Guide' (HDG) sets out principles for alterations to domestic properties. Policy HDG1 of this document states that extensions should respect the scale, form, proportions and character and appearance of the main building and the locality. Extensions should be subordinate to the main building.
5. The Council is concerned that the combined width of the proposed two storey single storey side extensions would be excessive, on the grounds that they would exceed two thirds of the width of the existing front elevation. Whilst that would be so, the extensions would be set back by a significant distance from the front of No 24. This would enable the original form of the house to remain clearly legible.
6. The extensions would step down, creating a progressive reduction in height and scale that would, in my view, achieve an acceptable degree of visual subservience. The proposed design and materials would match those of the existing building, and the new roof pitches would reflect that of the existing roof. These factors would help the extensions blend successfully with the appearance of the main house. I consider that the generously sized corner plot is large enough to accommodate the development without it appearing too cramped or out of scale with its surroundings.
7. I agree that the two thirds rule is a guideline, and that as such it should be applied flexibly in response to the specific circumstances of each site. I have also had regard to the fallback position whereby a garage of very similar dimensions could be built under permitted development rights if it were detached from No 24. The appeal scheme would not have a materially greater impact than such a proposal, and so I give the fallback position significant weight.
8. Drawing these factors together, I therefore conclude that the development would not unduly harm the character or appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy, which promotes good design appropriate to its scale and function, and Policy BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (LUDPR), which states that all alterations and extensions should respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building. There would be no conflict with LUDPR Policy GP5, which seeks to ensure that proposals resolve a range of detailed planning considerations. The development would accord with the principles set out in the HDG, and finally, would comply with the aim of the National Planning Policy Framework to secure high quality design.

Conditions

9. For certainty, it is necessary that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. A condition relating to materials is appropriate in the interests of character and appearance.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Elaine Gray

INSPECTOR