



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019

by A McCormack BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/19/3236065

89 Plantation Gardens, Leeds LS17 8ST

- 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 Mrs Carol Bains against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03138/FU, dated 21 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension to side and detached garage to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension and detached garage to rear at 89 Plantation Gardens, Leeds LS17 8ST, in accordance with the terms of application Ref: 19/03138/FU, dated 21 May 2019, 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: Drawing No: 2524 001 – 'Existing Location Plan'; Drawing No: 2524 010 – 'Existing Plans and Elevations'; Drawing No: 2524 051B – 'Proposed Block Plan'; and Drawing No: 2524 060D – 'Proposed Plans and Elevations'.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Policy HDG1 of the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that extensions, additions and alterations should respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality with particular regard had to, amongst other things, the roof form and materials. Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (CS) says that development should be of high design quality, appropriate to its context and respect the character of its surroundings. This is complemented by Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and these policies are in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
4. The locality is characterised by a general uniformity in the appearance of properties and a suburban pattern of development with an open landscaped street scene.

Most properties have similar gable frontages, have two storeys and are detached. Furthermore, several nearby properties have two storey side extensions.

5. The proposed extension would appear as a subservient addition to the host property. Its roof ridge height would be stepped down from the original roof and it would be set back from the main frontage of the property by about 1 metre. Its width would be about two thirds of the main frontage of the original property. Therefore, it would comply with the guidance set out in the SPD.
6. Whilst the property occupies a prominent corner plot with a high degree visibility in the streetscene, I find that the additions proposed would not adversely impact on the spacious character and generally consistent appearance of nearby properties and the area. The volume, scale and visibility of the host property would inevitably increase as a result of the proposed development. However, it would be set back sufficiently from the public highway that the proposed additions would not appear overly dominant. Moreover, any such visual impact and mass due to the proposed additions would be mitigated further by the landscaped setting of the property in the streetscene. This view is supported by what I saw during my visit to the site and local area and by the photomontages provided in the appellant's submissions.
7. The gabled roof on the proposed side extension would be in keeping with, and reflect, an over-arching design element of the host property. It would also be broadly consistent in form and appearance with the majority of other properties in the surrounding area on Plantation Gardens.
8. The Council considers the proposed double garage would be acceptable. Whilst I note that its flat roof design would not be considered as an ideal design solution, it would be in keeping with other similar elements in the built form of the local area. As such, and in the absence of any substantive evidence to the contrary, I see no reason to differ from the Council's assessment in this respect.
9. Having considered all before me, I find that the proposed scheme would increase the amount of living space available to the occupiers of the property. In doing so, the proposed side extension would have a subservient appearance and relationship to its host property. The extension and the detached garage would also reflect the over-arching character and appearance of other properties and the local area.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would have no significant adverse effect on the character or appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, it would comply with Policy HG1 of the SPD, Policy P10 of the CS, Policies GP5 and BD6 of the UDP and the relevant sections of the Framework.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard conditions relating to time and the approved plans, I have attached a further condition regarding matching the materials of external surfaces of the development permitted to those of the host property. I find this condition to be necessary and reasonable for reasons of character and appearance.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed, subject to the conditions stated.

A McCormack

INSPECTOR