
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2019

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/19/3226478

8 Stainburn View, Moor Allerton, Leeds, LS17 6PS

- 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 Haroon Qureshi against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00598/FU, dated 31 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is a front double storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front double storey extension at 8 Stainburn View, Moor Allerton, Leeds, LS17 6PS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00598/FU, dated 31 January 2019, 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: 1:1250 location plan, 1:500 block plan and 1:100 proposed elevations and floor plans drawing number 1920-1.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house. It is set back from the road by a modest front garden and has a driveway and carport to the side. The original hipped roof has been altered to a gable end as part of a previous loft conversion development and a porch extension has been added to the front. A two-storey bay window extends across the central section of the pair of semi-detached houses.
4. Stainburn View slopes upwards in a north westerly direction. It comprises semi-detached houses, originally of identical design, which follow a well-defined building line. However, the majority of the dwellings on Stainburn View have been altered and extended in various ways, including hip to gable alterations to the roofs, large dormer extensions, side and rear extensions and front porches.

Neighbouring No. 10 Stainburn View has a two-storey extension to the front, which is almost identical to the appeal proposal.

5. The proposed development would project 1.5m from the front elevation of the house and less than 1m beyond the front of the existing front porch and bay windows. It would create a larger entrance porch at the ground floor level and a larger bedroom above. The roof would be hipped and the ridge line would be well below that of the main dwelling.
6. The very similar extension next door does not appear dominant or detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene. As such, there is no logical reason why the appeal proposal would either. In granting permission for the neighbouring extension in 2004 the Council must have been satisfied that it would not result in any harm. According to their report the only thing that has changed since that time is the Householder Design Guide (HDG), the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The change in policy does not change the effect of a development on the character and appearance of the area.
7. The reason for refusal does not refer to the HDG or the Framework. It does however refer to the Neighbourhoods for Living Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). I have been provided with a copy of the SPG, which is referred to in the decision notice. This is dated December 2003 and therefore predates the adjacent extension. Moreover both the SPG and the NPPG offer general design guidance only and do not go into any detail regarding house extensions.
8. Whilst the extension would further unbalance the pair of semi-detached houses, given the existing differences to the front of these dwellings, in terms of the roof shape, the porch and different windows, together with the alterations that have been made to other dwellings in the street, it would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the wider street scene.
9. For the reasons given above, the development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and I find no material conflict with saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review or with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy, which seek amongst other things to ensure proposals are well designed and that extensions respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building and the wider locality. I also find no conflict with relevant advice from the Neighbourhoods for Living SPG or the NPPG, which I have had regard to as material considerations.

Conditions and Conclusion

10. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the statutory time limit condition, a condition listing the approved plans for the purposes of clarification and a condition to ensure matching external materials are used in the interests of good design and protecting the character and appearance of the area.

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR