
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2020 by C McDonagh BA (Hons), MA

by Richard Clegg BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/19/3243907

15 Plantation Avenue, Leeds, West Yorkshire LS15 0LL

- 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 Dean Zyke against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/04988/FU, dated 7 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'a two-storey side and rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural matter

3. Part of the rear extension would be storey in height. Accordingly, the proposed development is more clearly described as a two-storey side and a part two/part single-storey rear extension, and the appeal has been considered on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof and attached garage. The street scene is characterised by this style of housing, although many of the properties have seen alterations such as porches, gable roofs and extensions. Overall, the street has retained a spacious and open sense, and is punctuated by generous gaps between the pairs of semis creating a sense of rhythm.
6. The proposal would see the erection of a largely two-storey side and rear extension which would sit flush with the front elevation of the host building while incorporating a matching hipped roof, and which would replace the

existing garage. This would project towards the side of the adjacent property at No.17, which has also been extended.

7. My attention is drawn to the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) which seeks through policy HDG1 to ensure extensions, additions and alterations respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.
8. The introduction of built form at first floor level in this location would add substantial mass to the dwelling. Given the lack of set-back from the front elevation of the host building it would lack subordination and further close the gap between No.15 and No.17. While I understand the desire of the appellant to increase their living space, this would erode the sense of openness which at present makes a positive contribution to the street scene and is an important characteristic to the area, despite the use of matching materials to complement the existing property.
9. As the appellant contends, during the site visit I did note the side extensions to No.2 and No.17. However, I have no information relating to No.2, although from my observations it appeared to be of considerable age and is also located at the entrance to the street with no adjacent building. The extension of No.17 evidently dates from 1999, which is some time before the adoption of the Leeds Core Strategy (CS) (2014) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Regardless, I can only assess the proposal on its own merits and against current planning policy.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building and street scene. It would therefore be contrary to policies P10 of the CS, GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (UDPR) (2006), HDG1 of the SPD (2012) and advice contained within paragraph 127 of the Framework. Collectively, these seek to ensure extensions are of high-quality design and respectful of the original scale of their hosts while being sympathetic to local character.

Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Richard Clegg

INSPECTOR