



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2021

by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/21/3282109

20 Fourth Avenue, Wetherby, LS22 6JW

- 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 Serdar & Mrs Emma Gunduz against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02897/FU, dated 1 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension to an end terrace property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension to an end terrace property at 20 Fourth Avenue, Wetherby, LS22 6JW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/02897/FU, dated 1 April 2021, 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 carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan Drawing No 1; Block Plan Drawing No 2; Existing Floor Plans Drawing No 3; Existing Elevations Drawing No 4; Proposed Floor Plans Drawing No 5; and Proposed Elevations Drawing No 6.
 - 3) The materials to be used on 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 in the appeal is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is the end house in a terrace of 4. The two end dwellings in the terrace have a different roof form and are deeper than the two middle houses. In addition, at first floor level the end properties have 5 narrow windows in close proximity to each other that is a distinctive feature on these houses.
4. No 20, like many properties located on corner plots and on bends in the road in the vicinity, has a substantial side garden. These, together with the generous

grass verges along the roadside, give a sense of spaciousness to the area and are a key characteristic of the locality.

5. The proposed extension would be located on part of this side garden but would still retain a significant garden area between it and the boundary with Third Avenue. As such, the plot would not appear overdeveloped or cramped and would retain a sense of openness that would continue to contribute to this key feature of the estate. The front corner of the proposed extension would be nearest to the boundary, but the distance it would retain would be similar to that between No 7 and its boundary on the junction with Second Avenue. As such, it would not be out of keeping.
6. Whilst the extension would be visible when approaching the junction in either direction along Third Avenue, in such views it would be seen against the backdrop of either the terrace on the other side of Fourth Avenue or the houses to the rear on Hallfield Crescent. Given this, its visual impact on the sense of openness would be limited.
7. Detailed guidance on extensions to dwellings is found in the *Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (adopted April 2012)* (HDG). This advises that due to their prominence great care needs to be given to the design of two storey side extensions. Generally, it is indicated that they should not be more than two-thirds of the width of the host property, that the roof form, and window detailing, should match the existing, and that they should achieve a degree of subservience.
8. The width of the proposed extension would be approximately two thirds of the width of the main dwelling and has been designed to reflect the middle dwellings in the terrace. As such, the windows in it, rather than reflecting the distinctive narrow windows on the host property, would reflect the proportion and style of the windows on Nos 16 and 18. Similarly the roof form and ridge height match those of the middle houses.
9. The extension would be set in slightly from the front and rear elevation of the main dwelling. At the front this set back would be similar to the distance the two middle dwellings in the terrace are set back. Whilst normally a greater set back is required, in this case I consider following the pattern established by the middle dwellings is appropriate. At the rear the set back would not quite match the middle dwellings. However, the difference is not large and given the limited visibility of the rear of the dwellings, this inconsistency would not have a harmful impact on the street scene.
10. Overall, I accept the extension would not accord with all the guidance in the HDG and would not achieve the degree of subservience that may normally be expected. However, in this case, due to the design of the terrace and the way the extension has been designed to reflect this, I consider that it would be a sympathetic addition to the host property and the terrace, and would not be detrimental to the street scene. In particular, it would not unbalance the terrace in the way some side extensions might do. I noted that a similar approach was taken with a side extension on No 12 Third Avenue, and has resulted in an extension that is a sympathetic addition to the house and area.
11. Consequently, I consider that the proposed extension would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. Therefore, it would not conflict with Policy P10 of the *Leeds Core Strategy*

(as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) (adopted September 2019), Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) (adopted July 2006), or Policy HDG1 of the HDG which, amongst other things, require developments to provide good design that respects the host property and the local area. Nor would it be contrary to paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure that developments are sympathetic to the character of the built environment.

Conclusion and Conditions

12. For the reasons set out above I conclude the appeal should be allowed.
13. As well as the standard implementation condition, to provide certainty it is necessary to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to control the external appearance of the proposal.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR