



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2019

by Caroline Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/19/3234195

2 Green Crescent, Meanwood, Leeds LS6 4JZ

- 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 Ms Philippa Green against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03802/FU, dated 18 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2019.
 - The development was originally described on the application form as "*Same as previously approved but this amendment moves the first floor wall forward to line up with the ground floor (simpler construction and extension is still subservient to main dwelling) - no change to the first floor roof for this. Then to keep it looking more similar to the approved I have shown a roof over a wide porch and then added another window to the side of the single storey extension to improve morning sunlight penetration*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part two storey side, part single storey side extension and driveway to front at 2 Green Crescent, Meanwood, Leeds LS6 4JZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/03802/FUL, dated 18 May 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: Drawing Numbers 1500, 1501, 1502, 1503 and 1504.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until all areas shown on the approved plans to be used by vehicles have been fully laid out, surfaced and drained such that the surface water does not discharge or transfer onto the highway. These areas shall not be used for any other purpose thereafter.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the decision above differs to that on the application form and decision notice which were not wholly accurate. Both

parties have agreed to the amended wording which I consider a more concise and accurate description of development.

3. Whilst the appellant put forward alternative schemes within her appeal statement, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the scheme and the plans which were before the Council when it made its decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached dwelling situated on a spacious plot at the junction of Green Crescent and Green View. The dwelling is characteristic of those within the surrounding area with its predominant feature a two storey bay window which spans the pair of properties. The front plane of the hipped roof extends to meet the bay and overhangs the returning front façade.
6. The proposal comprises a part two, part single storey side extension with hipped roofs to match the existing and the addition of a driveway to the front of the property. The Council has raised no objection to the driveway and I have no reason to reach a different view.
7. Whilst the front elevation of the extension would have only a small set back from the adjacent façade, it would be sufficient to break up the mass of the front elevation and to avoid any awkward join between old and new materials. Moreover, the ridgeline and eaves level would be appreciably lower than that of the host property which serves to underline the extension's subservience. When viewed from the side, the extension would be seen in the context of the projecting two storey bay and roof overhang which would further reduce the perceived scale of the extension.
8. The design reflects that of the main dwelling, including the ground floor canopy which would be a modest addition that replicates the pitch and shape of the main roof. Furthermore, the orientation and set back of the dwelling within the plot would reduce the overall prominence of the extension within the wider street scene. Given the above, and being mindful that an extension of the same height and width has been approved, albeit with a greater set back, I am not persuaded that the proposed extension would significantly unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties.
9. I note that the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Household Design Guide' (SPD) suggests a 2m set back for two storey extensions from the main wall of the dwelling. However, this guidance relates to streets of regular semi-detached dwellings where the spaces between houses are important in defining the character and appearance of an area. These particular circumstances do not apply to the appeal property which, together with its neighbour, straddles a corner plot. In any event, adequate space to the side of the property would be retained by virtue of the single storey element.
10. Therefore, as a result of the particular circumstances pertaining to the appeal site and host property, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host

property or the surrounding area and find no conflict with Policy HDG1 of the SPD, P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (2014), Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) or paragraphs 127 and 130 of the Framework. Together these seek, amongst other things, high quality development that is appropriate to its context and respects the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.

11. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have specified the approved plans in order to provide certainty. A condition requiring the materials match the existing is necessary on the interests of visual amenity and that relating to the proposed driveway is necessary in the interests of highway safety.
12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Caroline Jones

INSPECTOR