



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2022

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3294913

61 New Temple Gate, Halton, Leeds LS15 0JL

- 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 Ian Watson against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/07860/FU, dated 20 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "single storey front and side extensions and detached garage to rear".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey front and side extensions and detached garage to rear at 61 New Temple Gate, Halton, Leeds LS15 0JL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/07860/FU, dated 20 September 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: 21/01; 21/02; 21/03; 21/04; 21/05; 21/06; 21/07.
 - 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 main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The area surrounding the appeal site is characterised predominantly by residential properties. There are a mix of buildings in the area including bungalows and two storey houses with there being various architectural designs, materials, detailing, sizes and roof forms. It is this variation in the built form that positively contributes to the character of the area.
4. The appeal property sits within a prominent corner plot that is viewed differently to the row of bungalows to the east. The proposed extensions, given the positioning of the appeal property, would ensure that the staggered pattern of the existing building line is not adversely compromised.

5. The massing of the bungalow would significantly increase as a result of the proposals however, given the sensitive design including sufficient set back from the boundaries to the highways, the extensions would not appear as overwhelming structures that would dominate the appeal property or the street scene.
6. The roof form including some of the pitch would alter, nevertheless, the roof height would be mostly retained and this would not be out of keeping with the mix of roof types and forms in the area. The loss of the bay window would also not compromise the appearance of the property or the street scene, particularly given the variation in architectural styles in the area.
7. Due to the size, design and location of the proposed extensions, as well as the variation of built forms in the area, the proposals would not be an incongruous development that detracts from the appeal property or the surrounding area.
8. Accordingly, the proposals would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area. The proposals would not contradict Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy Development Plan Document, Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review, Policy HDG1 of the Leeds Householder Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks all extensions, additions and alterations to respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.

Conditions

9. Conditions relating to timeliness and the identification of plans are necessary in the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty. In the interests of character and appearance a condition is necessary in relation to materials.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would not conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding.
11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR