



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2022

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3300020

50 South View Crescent, Yeadon, Leeds LS19 7JA

- 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 Mrs Joanne Murray against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00617/FU, dated 26 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension above existing ground floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached property in a residential area. On the approach along South View Crescent, the pattern of development is generally uniform. Clear spacings in-between the pairs of semi-detached properties are created by long driveways. While there are varying property types the area has an inherently open character.
4. There is an existing ground floor side extension, which is set back a short distance from the primary elevation. It fills the open space between the main property and the shared boundary almost entirely. The addition of a first floor extension would make the built form unduly dominant.
5. I note that the neighbouring property at 48 South View Crescent has a two storey side extension. However, this is set further back from the primary elevation than the proposal before me, and there remains a clear gap to the side due to a remaining driveway. While the proposal would, to a degree, balance the pair of semi-detached properties, unlike no 48, the space between no 50 and its neighbour would be reduced and would not relate positively to the open character of the area.
6. I have also had regard to the other examples of existing side extensions nearby. From my site visit I found these to have a different built form and spacing around the properties to the proposal before me. As such, these side extensions have not undermined the character and appearance of the area in the way that the proposal would.

7. Consequently, for the reasons given, this proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. This is in conflict with saved Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006), and Policy P10 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy selective Review 2019) which, amongst other things, seeks new development that contributes to place making and is of a size, scale and form that is appropriate to its context.

Other Matters

8. I have given careful consideration to the appellant's need to extend their property to create extra space for their growing family. However, these are largely personal circumstances and, therefore, of limited weight.

Conclusion

9. My above findings bring the proposals into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that have been shown to have sufficient weight to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed

F Harrison

INSPECTOR