



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2021 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/21/3267904

8A Firthfields, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 2HD

- 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 Eleanor Wilkinson against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/06277/FU, dated 30 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as construction of new two storey side extension including internal alterations.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling with a two-storey side extension adjacent. Planning permission¹ has recently been granted for a single-storey side extension on the opposite side of the property to the existing extension, although construction of this extension had yet to begin at the time of my site visit. The proposed development would see the erection of a two-storey side extension in place of the approved single-storey extension.
5. The street is comprised of a mix of housing types, designs, materials and roof types. Adjacent to the appeal site to the north is a terrace of four dwellings, while to the south are detached and semi-detached properties. On the other side of the street is a community centre and open space, with semi-detached dwellings to the south. The properties are finished with a mix of brick and white render.
6. While the proposed two-storey side extension alone may be considered to respect the proportions of the main house, when combined with the existing

¹ Planning application ref. 20/01064/FU

two-storey side extension then the extensions would overwhelm the original dwelling and totally alter its character and appearance. As such, I find that the proposal taken with the existing extension fails to respect the proportions of the main house.

7. The dwellings in the street have varying amounts of separation to the adjacent properties, and a few of the properties have two-storey side extensions built up to or close to the boundary. In this case, the existing two-storey side extension is built up to the shared driveway with No 10A, however there is a generous gap between the dwelling and No 8 which makes a positive contribution to this part of Firthfields.
8. The introduction of built form at first floor level in this location would add substantial mass to the dwelling. That massing would be set only a limited distance back from the main front elevation of the dwelling and as such the apparent bulk of the building would be substantially increased. While a gap would remain between the proposed extension and the side elevation of No 8, the spaciousness around the appeal property would be eroded and as such the appeal property would appear cramped in its plot. Consequently, the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene. The use of matching materials as proposed would not mitigate this harmful effect.
9. I accept that the approved single-storey extension would have the same width as the proposed extension, however without the first-floor element the extension would have considerably less massing than the proposed extension. Consequently, this would allow the single storey to respect the proportions of the main house and retain a degree of space between the appeal property and No 8. Therefore, this fallback position would not cause harm to the appeal property or street scene and does not justify the appeal proposal.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene in conflict with Policy P10 of the of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (2014), Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006). These policies all seek, in various ways, for the size, scale and design of a development to be appropriate to its context and to respect the character and quality of the host property, and the surrounding area. The proposal would also be contrary to the guidance set out in policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide (2012), which has similar aims to the above policies. Furthermore, the proposal would conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that permission should be refused for development of poor design.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I find that there are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

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, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR