



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 26 October 2021

by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/21/3281283

33 West Lea Crescent, Yeadon, Leeds, LS19 7EE

- 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 & Mrs Paul Doncaster against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04019/FU, dated 5 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'two storey extension to front and conversion of garage to habitable accommodation.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey extension to the front and conversion of the garage to habitable accommodation at 33 West Lea Crescent, Yeadon, Leeds, LS19 7EE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/04019/FU, dated 5 May 2021 and the plans submitted with it, 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: Drawing numbers 9355 (site location/block plan) and 9355/02 Revision A (proposed plans/elevations).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces and roof of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. Paragraph 218 indicates that its policies are material considerations which should be taken into account in dealing with applications from the day of publication. The principal parties were therefore invited to comment on any implications of the revised Framework for this appeal. I have determined the appeal having regard to the provisions of the revised Framework.
3. The description of development in the banner heading and formal decision above is taken from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form since it omits reference to the proposed dormer window to the rear which does not form part of the appeal proposal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, having particular regard to the West Lea Crescent street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on a residential cul-de-sac to the west of Yeadon town centre. Development on West Lea Crescent comprises a mixture of semi-detached dormer window dwellings and two storey dwellings of varying styles and materials, separated by driveways and/or garages. Some properties have been extended to the side and front, including the adjoining dwelling at No 35 which has a single storey side extension and garage which projects forward of the original front elevation. The appeal proposal is similar in scale and appearance to the two storey extensions to the front of Nos 27 and 32. Overall, the different dwelling designs, alterations and extensions results in differences in the spacing between properties and some irregularity in the building line, contributing to a varied street scene.
6. The accommodation within the garage space would be served by a new window which would not have any impact on the street scene. Although it would be two storeys in height, the front extension would have a compact gable and its ridge height would be well below the existing dwelling. It would extend approximately 1.8 metres from the existing front wall, but there would be sufficient separation distance to the road to ensure that there would be no significant loss of openness to the front of the dwelling. Overall, its height, bulk and massing would be subordinate to the existing dwelling and it would appear as a subordinate addition. The original form of the host property would remain apparent and, subject to the use of matching bricks and roof tiles, the front extension would not harm its character and appearance.
7. There would inevitably be some loss of symmetry to Nos 31 and 33 as a semi-detached pair, but this would be seen in conjunction with the extensions at Nos 27 and 32 and the variation in the dwelling styles and building line in the street scene. In this context, the extension would not appear unduly prominent or out of keeping with surrounding development. The gabled form would also reflect the form of the extension to the front of No 35 and therefore would not appear discordant or out of place.
8. The Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) indicates that whilst small additions to the front of dwellings may be possible, larger additions are unlikely to be acceptable especially where a row of properties displays a uniform character. In addition, SPD principle HDG1 requires extensions to respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.
9. The extensions at Nos 27 and 32 were built in 2005 and 1988 respectively, prior to the adoption of the Leeds Core Strategy Select Review (2019) (Core Strategy) and the SPD, which seek to raise standards of design more generally. Under the guidance in the SPD, a two storey extension would be a larger addition to the property. However, the surrounding area is not uniform in terms of the pattern and style of development and for the reasons outlined above, the proposal would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host property and would not harm the character of the West Lea Crescent street

scene. I consider that these aspects accord with general principle HDG1. However, I have come to this conclusion based on the specific circumstances of the appeal site, its surroundings and the details of the scheme before me.

10. For the reasons outlined above, I have found that the proposal would be an appropriate addition to the host property and would not harm the character and appearance of the West Lea Crescent street scene. For these reasons, the proposal would comply with the requirements of Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) and Core Strategy Policy P10 to secure high quality design for new development and that alterations and extensions should respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building. There would be compliance with the provisions of the Framework for development to be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

11. The extension is required to help accommodate family members with care needs. However, as I have concluded that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, the need for the proposed development has not been determinative in my assessment of the appeal.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit, a condition is required to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition specifying matching materials is also necessary.
13. For the reasons outlined above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be allowed.

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR