



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2021

by K Savage BA MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3264751

1 Chatsworth Crescent, Stanningley, Pudsey LS28 8LB

- 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 Mohammed Idris against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/06040/FU, dated 21 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension with single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension with single storey side and rear extension, at 1 Chatsworth Crescent, Stanningley, Pudsey LS28 8LB, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/06040/FU, dated 21 September 2020, and 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: 20-075-P-01 (Site Location Plan); 20-075-P-02 (Existing and Proposed Plans); 20-075-P-03 (Existing and Proposed Elevations).
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan number 20-075-P-03.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located to one end of Chatsworth Crescent, in a short stretch of the street leading from Chatsworth Road which is characterised by similar two storey, semi-detached pairs, before the road turns and a different character of semi-detached, single storey dwellings predominates. The rear elevations of two storey, semi-detached dwellings on Chatsworth Road are visible to the side of the appeal site. Behind the site is the prominent three storey rear elevation of the commercial terrace on Galloway Lane, of which the lower two storeys have no windows.

4. The site itself benefits from a generous side garden, which presently includes a single storey garage. Within the street, only 2 Chatsworth Crescent directly opposite enjoys a similar size of side garden, and has twin single storey garages to the side of the dwelling. The proposed extension would see the single storey garage replaced with a two storey side extension and a wider single storey element at ground floor level, which would wrap around the taller element and join onto the proposed single storey extension at the rear.
5. Policy HDG1 of the Leeds Householder Design Guide (April 2012) (the HDG) sets out that all extensions, additions and alterations should respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality. The presence of the existing garage means a certain massing already exists to the side, albeit at low level.
6. Viewed against the overall scale of the dwelling, the two storey element would not be excessive in width. It would match the roof form of the existing dwelling. The front roof slope would sit below the main roof ridge line and the front elevation would be recessed. These factors would create a subordinate appearance and scale to the extension and would allow the original dwelling, and the semi-detached pair, to still be understood.
7. The ground floor element would extend further to the side, but would only marginally extend beyond the existing footprint of the garage, and would not intrude noticeably further across the site than at present. The ground floor extension would have a low, shallow pitched roof and would appear as a subservient element relative to both the two storey extension and the main dwelling. Importantly, the extension would not appear excessive in size for the plot, as there would remain ample garden area to the side, and the spaciousness of the townscape between the appeal dwelling and the rear elevations of 1-5 Chatsworth Road and 54 Galloway Lane would not be visibly diminished.
8. I acknowledge that, overall, the side extension would be almost as wide as the existing dwelling; however, it would be viewed in context not only with the parent dwelling, but with the larger overall massing of the semi-detached pair, against which it would not appear excessive or dominant in scale, given the lower roof height and recessed, narrow first floor element that would distinguish the extension as a subservient addition. Consequently, it would not harmfully detract from the original pair or the wider pattern of semi-detached pairs to this side of the street.
9. The proposal would introduce a greater extent of painted render to the front facade than exists on neighbouring properties, but it would retain red brick to the side of the first floor extension and as a detail on the front elevation. Overall, the palette of materials would be reflective of the surrounding context and would not detract from the street scene.
10. The rear single storey element would have limited visibility from the street, but would be modest in height and depth, and would not harm the prevailing pattern of development at the rear, which features a number of extensions.
11. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the area, and no conflict would arise with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (2019) or saved Policies GP5 and DB6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan, which together require new development to deliver high

quality inclusive design which respects the character and quality of surrounding buildings; the streets and spaces that make up the public realm and the wider locality; and that all alterations and extensions should respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building. Nor do I find conflict with the guidance of the HDG or the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of seeking high quality design in new development.

Conditions

12. To provide certainty, a condition is required specifying the relevant drawings. A condition requiring external surface materials to be implemented as per the plans is also necessary in order to secure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

13. For the foregoing reasons and taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

K Savage

INSPECTOR