



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3364615

58 Derwent Avenue, Garforth, Leeds LS25 1HS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Josh Shelton against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application reference is 24/07084/FU.
 - The development proposed is a front porch with living room extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front porch with living room extension at 58 Derwent Avenue, Garforth, Leeds in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 24/07084/FU, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans in so far as they relate to the front extension and chimney alterations only: 591-01 and 591-02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The council altered the description to make reference to the proposed changes to the chimney. As there is no evidence to indicate that the appellant agreed to this change, the description in the application form is set out above. I have fully considered the changes to the chimney although no concerns have been raised in this regard. The plans show a side facing dormer window which appears to be larger than the existing. As the application makes no reference to any changes; and the existing and proposed plans shown the same size of dormer, I have assumed that this is a drafting error and have not considered it further.
4. The house is of a relatively modern appearance and is the last property in a row of four that have a similar design, particularly characterised by their asymmetrical roofs. The wider area, including the other neighbouring property in Templars Way, includes a mix of different, relatively modern house styles but also include other houses of this design. Because of its corner position, the appeal property is set

further back from the road than its neighbours and is partially screened by both street and garden trees and vegetation. Its frontage is therefore much less prominent within the public domain than the frontages of its neighbours, particularly the two at the other end of this short row of four similar houses.

5. The front addition would sit below the height of the first-floor windows with a lean-to roof to the living room extension and a small gable above the new front porch. The pitch of the gable would not be dissimilar to that of the main roof. The brickwork would match the existing. This new addition would not alter the distinctive form of the dwelling and would sit comfortably against the backdrop of the front elevation. It would not appear as a prominent new feature within the street scene given its limited size and depth, the position of this particular house and the existing vegetation. It would represent a suitable design solution in this context and would not detract from the character or appearance of the area.
6. Policy P10 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) requires that a development is of a size, scale, design and layout that is appropriate to its context and respects the character and quality of surrounding buildings. The proposal would not conflict with this policy. As the changes would be sympathetic, there would similarly be no conflict with policies GP5 or BD6 of the Unitary Development Plan Review (2006); or the design requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.
7. Reference is made to the council's Supplementary Planning Document: Householder Design Guide 2012. This suggests that extensions to the front of properties are often very difficult to accommodate and advises that larger additions are unlikely to be acceptable, especially if a row of properties display a uniform character. It refers separately to front extensions and porches. This proposal combines both the porch and living room elements, which individually, are relatively modest in size.
8. The guidance advises that single storey front extensions may be acceptable where the house is well set back from the front boundary; there is a lack of uniformity within the street scene; and where the proposal would not harm the character of the locality. This proposal falls within these parameters given its setback and the differing house designs in Templars Way. The porch is also of an appropriate scale and design. The proposal would not therefore conflict with the design expectations of the guidance or policy HDG1.
9. As the proposal would not detract from the character or appearance of the area and as there are no other matters that weigh significantly against it, I allow the appeal.
10. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and the details of the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have made reference to the front extension and chimney alterations as the proposal does not relate to the dormer window. The application form sets out the details of the materials to be used and a condition is necessary to ensure that these match to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR