
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2022

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3300631

11 Wynmore Crescent, Bramhope, Leeds LS16 9DH

- 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 Adrian Ballam against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00934/FU, dated 9 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension; first floor front extension and first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side extension; first floor front extension and first floor side extension at 11 Wynmore Crescent, Bramhope, Leeds LS16 9DH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00934/FU, dated 9 September 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: Site Location Plan; J36-91 001; J36-91 002; J36-91 003.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. For the sake of clarity and brevity I have taken the description of development from the Councils decision notice.
3. The Council have not raised any concerns with the proposed single storey side extension, two storey side extension and front dormer. The Councils concerns relate to the first floor front extension. I have assessed the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the first floor front extension on the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The area surrounding the appeal site is characterised predominantly of two storey residential properties. The properties immediately adjacent to the appeal

property are similar in design and size however, there is a mix of various house styles and form along Wynmore Crescent and in the surrounding area. It is this varied built form that contributes positively to the character of the area.

6. The proposed first floor front extension would be prominent however, due to its scale, design and siting, it would not be an incongruous structure on the appeal building and it would not appear visually intrusive within the street scene. Neighbouring properties do share similar design styles to the existing appeal property. This similar design style is only present for a small section of Wynmore Crescent and the wider street scene has a much more varied appearance with different built forms and sizes. The proposal would be in keeping with the built form of the wider area and would not compromise the character of the surrounding area.
7. Accordingly, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area. The proposal would be in accordance with saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan, Policy P10 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy and Policy HDG1 of the Leeds Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document which seeks all extensions, additions and alterations to respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.

Conditions

8. 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

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

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR