
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2017

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/17/3180129

West Winds, Linden Close, Bardsey, Leeds, LS17 9AH

- 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 Andy Stoner against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/01272/FU, dated 27 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at West Winds, Linden Close, Bardsey, Leeds, LS17 9AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/01272/FU, dated 27 February 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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 Plan Edged Red and Drawing 5120/02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the extension upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a semi-detached house, of inter-war appearance, located on a quiet private lane within a wider residential area. The main elevation of the dwelling is at the rear which can be seen from Keswick Lane and both the front and the back of the house are visible from public areas.
4. Policy HDG1 of the *Leeds Householder Design Guide* indicates that extensions should respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling. The proposed roof would be hipped to replicate the existing roof and the extension would be much less than half of the width of the original building. The windows would be of a similar size, shape and position as other first floor windows. I appreciate that the extension would be flush with the main elevation of the house and it would be set back only 30mm from the

Linden Close Elevation. However, as it would be about 1m from the side boundary, I consider that a “terracing effect” would not occur. Overall, I consider that the extension would meet the aims and objectives of Policy HDG1.

5. I note the Council’s concern about space between buildings but given that the roof to the extension would slope away from the side elevation and that there would be 1m between the extension and the side boundary, I consider that sufficient space would be maintained. I also note the Council’s comment that views towards the surrounding countryside are an important part of the character of the house, but I noted on my visit that the dwelling is completely surrounded by other residential development. Whilst the countryside might be glimpsed in the distance, a view of the countryside through the gap between the appeal house and the one next door is not a particularly obvious feature of the site.
6. I have considered the Council’s concern about precedent. Given that I have concluded that the proposal would be acceptable on its own particular merits, I can see no reason why it would lead to harmful developments on other sites nearby.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would have an acceptable effect upon the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policy GP5 of the Unitary Development Plan Review 2006 or Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy, 2014, which, in combination, seek to ensure that development is of a good design which respects local character. Neither do I find conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which promotes good design.
8. I have considered the Council’s suggested conditions in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary, in the interests of precision, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. In the interests of visual amenity I have imposed a condition in relation to materials
9. For the above reasons I allow the appeal subject to conditions.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR