



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2019

by R E Walker BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/19/3237134 20 Austhorpe Grove, Leeds LS15 8PY

- 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 Carrie Playford against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02986/FU, dated 13 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension at 20 Austhorpe Grove, Leeds LS15 8PY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/02986/FU dated 13 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 drawings submitted with the application.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development given on the planning application form and appeal form differs slightly. I have used the description from the appeal form which accurately describes the proposal and was used by the Council on its decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a 2-storey semi-detached property, located on the corner of Austhorpe Grove and Barrowby Lane, within a residential area. Austhorpe Grove is characterised by semi-detached properties, generally set back from the road along a similar building line. The appeal property is angled with its front elevation orientated toward Barrowby Lane and side elevation facing Austhorpe Grove. This relationship distinguishes it from other properties

along Austhorpe Grove that face toward the street and are characterised by a more defined front building line.

5. I recognise that the proposed extension would project closer to Austhorpe Grove than other built form in the street and it would therefore breach the building line of those other properties. However, because of the distinguishing characteristics of the appeal property, I do not consider that this would result in an unacceptable effect on the spatial pattern of housing in Austhorpe Grove, or indeed, in the surrounding area.
6. The proposed development would retain some space to the side boundary and would be single storey, ensuring a sense of space above the extension to the original host property. Moreover, it would retain much of the space around the house when viewed from the public realm as a result of the retained front garden, the plot shape and the length of the rear garden adjacent to Austhorpe Grove. In this respect, I consider that it would not result in an unacceptable effect to the sense of space and openness within this part of the street.
7. In design terms the proposed extension would utilise matching materials, would be subservient to the host property and would be of a form which is distinct but compatible with the character of the house. I recognise that it would be clearly visible even with the hedge on the boundary. However, due to its design, scale and position adjacent to the side elevation, I do not consider that it would appear overly dominant or obtrusive in this context.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (CS) adopted 2014 or saved Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (Review 2006). Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that alterations are of an appropriate scale and design to the existing building and the wider context. I also find no conflict with Policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document April 2012 which has similar objectives.
9. Policy P10 of the CS and Policy GP5 of the UDP are consistent with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Consequently, I find no conflict with section 12 of the Framework which broadly seeks to secure high quality design.

Conditions

10. 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 to those submitted with the application. A condition concerning external materials is required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons the appeal is allowed subject to conditions.

Robert Walker

INSPECTOR