



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2021

by M Seaton DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3262132

19 East Ridge View, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 2PN

- 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 Joanne Johnson against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01941/FU, dated 26 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor extension to the side, conversion of garage to habitable room, and porch to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first-floor extension to the side, conversion of garage to habitable room, and porch to front at 19 East Ridge View, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 2PN in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/01941/FU dated 26 March 2020, and 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 in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, Block Plan, 1 Sheet of 4 20/005 Rev. A (Proposed Floor Plans), 3 Sheet of 4 20/005 Rev. A (Proposed Elevations), and 4 Sheet of 4 20/005 Rev. A (Sections/Cross Sections).
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a two-storey detached dwelling set within a residential area of varied character, design, and form. I observed there to be a degree of variation in the scale of properties with some much smaller dwellings juxtaposed with larger and extended properties.
4. The proposed extension would incorporate a front elevation and roof ridge height and form consistent with that of the existing dwelling. I have had regard

to the guidance for two-storey side extensions within the Leeds Householder Design Guide 2012 (HDG). Whilst accepting a general rule of subservience, I note the reference to a 2 metre set-back from the front wall and 1 metre off-set from the boundary is expressed in the terms of a street of regular, semi-detached dwellings. However, I also note that the HDG recognises detached houses as presenting a different context in respect of their design and form.

5. Even allowing for the location of the appeal plot, I do not find the closure of the existing gap at first floor level to be critical in the context of the street scene. There are irregular relationships between adjoining dwellings and clear evidence of minimal gaps between some adjoining properties in the area, with the neighbouring property at No. 17 incorporating a substantial cat-slide roof and varied roof form close to the common boundary. I am also not persuaded that the existing detailing of the property would be overwhelmed by the form and design of the extension as proposed.
6. Furthermore, given the variety of property sizes, widths and forms within the area, the resultant dwelling would sit comfortably within the wider range. I am also satisfied that despite not incorporating elements of subservience within the design of the side extension, the overall design, appearance, and massing of the resultant detached dwelling would neither appear as an uncharacteristic nor dominant presence within the street scene. The use of well-considered and sourced matching materials would assist with the assimilation of the extension to the existing dwelling.
7. I have noted the absence of objections from the Council to the proposed conversion of the garage and erection of a porch, and I see no reason to disagree with these conclusions.
8. For these reasons the proposed development would not result in an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. There would not be conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended, 2019), saved policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds UDP (2006), policy HDG1 of the HDG. These policies and guidance seek to ensure that extensions should represent a good quality of design and respect the scale, form, proportions, materials, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.

Conditions

9. In addition to conditions regarding timeliness and adherence to the submitted plans, I am satisfied that a condition securing the use of matching materials would be reasonable in the interests of the character and appearance of the dwelling and area.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, and subject to the conditions as listed, the appeal is allowed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR