



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2023 by T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3320503

8 Bedford Gardens, Cookridge, Leeds, LS16 6DH

- 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 Wrea Lashker against the decision of Leeds City Council.
- The application Ref 23/00437/FU, dated 23 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2023.
- The development proposed is part two, part single storey front, side and rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part two, part single storey front, side and rear extension at 8 Bedford Gardens, Leeds, LS16 6DH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00437/FU, dated 23 January 2023, 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: Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations 3479/01 Rev C.
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. There is some variation between the original description of development as shown on the application form and that used by the Council on the Notice of Decision. Whilst I am satisfied that both versions are seeking to describe the proposed development, I have used the description of development as shown on the decision notice in the banner heading and formal decision above, as it is a more accurate description of the proposal.
4. Planning permission was approved (LPA Ref: 22/00644/FU) in March 2022 for part two storey, part single storey front, side and rear extension. The development the subject of this appeal incorporates the previous form of development with modifications to the single storey front and side extension.

In this regard, whilst the whole scheme is before me, considering the existing extant planning permission, this appeal is focussed on the modifications, namely the single storey front extension, which is the sole focus in the decision notice issued by the Council and the focus of the Appellants appeal statement.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed single storey front extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site relates to a two-storey semi-detached property occupying a large corner plot within a residential estate consisting of a varied mix of semi-detached single and two storey properties. On my site visit, I observed several properties in the vicinity that had undergone alterations including the addition of porches, front rooflights and dormers and at No. 16 Bedford Gardens a front and side extension very similar to the proposal before me.
7. The proposed single-storey front extension would be modest in its depth and scale, projecting approximately 1.5m beyond the existing front elevation and extending halfway across the front of the existing property, in the position where the extant permission for the porch is proposed. The pitched roof and the use of matching materials and fenestration ensures the extension is sympathetic to the design features of the host property.
8. The proposed single-storey front extension would be visible from the street, although views of it would be partially obscured by existing mature landscaping that borders the front and side of the property, as well as a tall wooden gate. Therefore, considering the above factors I do not consider that the front extension would be appear as an incongruous feature to the host property nor detract from the surrounding area.
9. I acknowledge that the proposed development would result in the dwelling failing to mirror the adjoining property. However, considering the extant permission that is under construction and the presence of a highly visible, large flat-roofed rear dormer on the host property, any symmetry that may once have been present no longer exists. Moreover, the various alterations made to properties in the area has already altered the street scene, such that symmetry between pairs of dwellings is not a visually consistent element within the street scene.
10. Therefore, for the reasons above I conclude that the proposal would not be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) adopted November 2014 and HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide (2012). Together these seek, amongst other things, high quality development that is appropriate to its context and respects the scale, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality. It would also accord with the NPPF which has similar aims.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, a condition is necessary to ensure compliance with the approved plans. The

Council has also suggested a condition ensuring matching materials are used. In the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and street scene I agree that this condition would be necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, and subject to the specified conditions, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

T Bennett

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR