



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2021

by C Coyne BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/21/3284327

23 Westbourne Terrace, Garforth, West Yorkshire LS25 1DG

- 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 Miss Lisa Burgess against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03926/FU, dated 29 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension and render existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations including single storey front extension; new render and rooflight at 23 Westbourne Terrace, Garforth, West Yorkshire LS25 1DG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/03926/FU, dated 29 April 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: Site Location Plan; Proposed Elevations & Floor Plan; Proposed Site Plan.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on Proposed Elevations & Floor Plan.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council have described the development as 'alterations including single storey front extension; new render and rooflight'. I note that the appellant has also utilised a similar description on their appeal form. I consider that this revision provides an accurate description of the proposal and I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling with a single storey side extension and single storey front porch extension. The attached ground floor garage has been converted into a habitable room. The façade of the property is a mixture of red brick and white/cream render. The property is situated within a cul-de-sac with the surrounding area being predominately residential. The other

properties on Westbourne Terrace comprise a mixture of detached and semi-detached bungalows and detached two storey dwellings.

5. Some of these properties have cream/white/mint green rendered facades while others have an external material finish where the red bricks have been painted either mint green or cream/white. On my visit I also observed that one of the nearby properties had an extension with a wooden external material finish. Most of these properties also have chimneys, but not all of them do. As a result, I consider that the terrace has a varied mixture of styles and not a uniform style in relation to the external material finishes and designs of the properties there.
6. In their officer report the Council raised concerns in relation to the scale and bulk of the proposal's forward projection and the fact that its proposed rendered finish, hipped roof, and removal of the two existing chimneys would be at odds with the character of the other properties on the street. Concerns have also been raised that the proposed fenestration and door alterations would erode the existing character of the host property. However, the proposal would narrow the width of the ground and first floor windows that are currently larger than the corresponding windows on the other side of the host property's front elevation. Further, apart from a slight re-positioning the proposed new ground floor front window to the extended bedroom would be a similar size to that room's existing front window. Consequently, in these regards I consider that the proposal would improve the visual symmetry of the host property when viewed from the street.
7. Furthermore, the proposal's hipped roof would give it a subservient appearance in relation to the host property and its natural stone external material finish would match that of the front boundary walls. In addition, the proposal would also not extend further past the front building line of the existing porch extension. Moreover, the proposed render finish would match existing single storey side extension and would therefore not be out of keeping with other properties on the street and their general mixture of styles and external material finishes some of which are similarly rendered.
8. I also note that proposal would remove both chimneys. However, while many properties on the terrace have chimneys, not all of them do. As a result, the removal of these chimneys would not be totally at odds with the character of the other properties on the street. As a result, I find that the proposal would not have an adverse visual impact on either the host property or the street scene.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not materially harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area. Accordingly, it would not conflict with the relevant requirements of policy P10 of the adopted Core Strategy, saved policies GP5 and BD6 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan or policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard implementation condition, I have imposed a necessary condition to define the plans with which the scheme should accord in the interest of precision. I have also imposed a condition specifying that the materials be in accordance with those shown on the approved plans in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Coyne INSPECTOR