



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2021

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/21/3280960

41 West End Grove, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 5JJ

- 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 Hardisty against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02685/FU, dated 25 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is part two-storey front and single-storey rear extension with loft dormers added front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part two-storey front and single-storey rear extension with loft dormers added front and rear at 41 West End Grove, Leeds LS18 5JJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/02685/FU, dated 25 March 2021, 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: 3058 05; 3058 06; 3058 04 A; and 3058 03 A
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

2. The proposal includes a number of different elements, as set out in the development description above. However, it is only the two-storey front extension and front dormer to which the Council's reason for refusal is directed. I am satisfied, as evidenced by the content of the Council's delegated officer report and decision notice, that the Council do not find the other elements of the proposal to be unacceptable. I agree.
3. Thus, I consider that the main issue is the effect of the two-storey front extension and front dormer on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. West End Grove is characterised by detached and semi-detached two-storey houses. However, there is wide variety in their designs, and whether original or as a result of later extension, there are many examples of projecting elements at the front such as gables, porches, and integral garages with large dormers

above. This includes the immediate neighbour No 43, which has a front gable extension of similar length to that proposed, albeit lesser width, and a larger front dormer within the main roof. No 45 has two front gables, as do some properties on the opposite side of the road. This varied pattern of development is also repeated in the surrounding streets.

5. Accordingly, whilst the proposed two-storey gable extension and front dormer window would transform the appearance of the front of the house, they would not be out of character with the surrounding area. Furthermore, the two-storey extension would sit below the ridge of the main roof to maintain some sense of subordination, and as the top floor of accommodation would be contained wholly within the roofslope, I do not consider that the extension and dormer would result in the appearance of a three-storey house. The dormer would be higher up on the roof than most other dormers in the street. Nevertheless, it would be a small feature within a large roof, neatly lined up with the windows below, and in a street where dormers do exist. Thus, in the context of this streetscene, I am satisfied that the front extension and dormer would not appear unduly prominent or discordant.
6. I therefore conclude that the two-storey front extension and front dormer window would not harm the character or appearance of the area. Thus, the proposals comply with the design requirements of Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy 2014 (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), saved Policies BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006), as well as the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

Conditions

7. I have imposed the standard commencement and approved plans conditions for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building is necessary to ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR