



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 2 July 2021

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/21/3271022

22 Parkways Avenue, Oulton, Leeds LS26 8TW

- 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 and Mrs Marshall against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/07889/FU, dated 26 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front porch at 22 Parkways Avenue, Oulton, Leeds LS26 8TW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/07889/FU, dated 26 November 2020, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan & Block Plan as Existing & Proposed, Drawing Number LP1 Rev A; Floor Plans & Elevations as Proposed, Drawing Number P1 Rev A.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 20 July 2021, the Government published its revised National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'). It replaces the previous version published in February 2019. The Framework represents the Government's up-to-date planning policies for England and how they should be applied.
3. The circumstances of this appeal are such that it has not been necessary to seek comments from the parties on the revised Framework.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling. It is located on a corner plot in a development of similar residential properties.
6. The proposed porch would be sited on what is described as the front elevation of the property. It would involve the removal of an existing uPVC door surround that appears to be externally fixed to the outer wall. The porch would not project further from the property than the existing boundary wall to the rear garden of the property.
7. Due to its design, size and siting, when combined with the use of materials to match the host dwelling, the proposed porch would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. For these same reasons, it would not dominate the property or detract from its overall appearance. It would project no further than the existing boundary wall to the rear garden and due to its scale and siting, would not appear as an incongruous feature in the street-scene. The porch would not undermine the contribution of the front elevation of the property to the street-scene.
8. I do not agree with the Council that the uPVC door surround, that would be removed to facilitate the proposed development, is a key or an important feature of the appeal property. Despite being installed at the majority of properties in the street-scene, it is not of such architectural merit that the development should be prevented due to its removal. I observed that the feature was not present at number 43 Parkways Avenue, opposite the appeal site, nor at number 36 Parkways Avenue.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposed development therefore complies with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended 2019) and saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006). These policies seek, amongst other things, to promote good design and ensure the size, scale, design and layout of development is appropriate to its context and respects the character and quality of surrounding buildings.
10. The proposed development would also comply with guidance contained in Policy HDG1 of the Leeds Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012). This guidance outlines that extensions, additions and alterations should respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.
11. The proposed development would also comply with guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which outlines, amongst other things, that decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment, and that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area and the host property, it

is necessary to impose a planning condition requiring the use of matching materials.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR