

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2016

by Philip Lewis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/16/3156548

14 Ashfield Road, Stanningley, Pudsey LS28 6AF

- 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 A Alderson against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02528/FU, dated 20 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at 14 Ashfield Road, Stanningley, Pudsey LS28 6AF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/02528/FU, dated 20 April 2016, 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: 1445.1624 PO1; 1445.1624 PO2 Rev A and 1445.1624 P03 Rev A.
 - 3) No development shall commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue for the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is situated at the end of a short terrace of two storey dwellings on the corner of Ashfield Road and Ashfield Crescent. I saw at my site visit that the terrace steps down away from Ashfield Crescent. I also observed that the rear walls of the host dwelling are stepped in from the rear walls of the rest of the terrace, giving the gable facing Ashfield Crescent an asymmetrical appearance.
 4. The appeal proposal is for a stepped two storey side extension which would occupy the garden ground to the side of the host dwelling. Whilst the ground
-

floor would be of the same depth as the existing, the first floor would be set back from the front elevation by about 1.5 metres. The ridge line of the proposed extension would be set below the existing ridge, with the rear section of roof following the existing roofline.

5. The appeal property due to its corner position is prominent in the street scene. However, the proposed extension would appear as subordinate to the host dwelling due to its lower ridge height and the set back of its first floor. In this regard, I do not consider the proposed extension to be unacceptably proportioned. The roof line of the proposed extension would reflect the existing asymmetry and whilst the terrace overall steps down in height away from the host property, I do not find the lower ridge height proposed to be unacceptable. In terms of the proposed detailing, the scale and position of windows and doors would not be unreflective of the terrace and I note the proposed use of matching external materials.
6. I have considered that the Leeds Local Development Framework Householder Design Guide (HDG) sets out that a 1 metre gap should be kept between side extensions and boundaries so as to prevent important gaps being eroded. The proposed extension would be sited close to the back of the footway and occupy much of the side garden of the dwelling. This would give rise to some loss of soft landscaping to the side of the property. However, the garden to the front of the dwelling would be retained and there would continue to be a significant gap between the appeal property and that opposite across the street on Ashfield Crescent. Although I note the comment that houses in the area predominantly retain landscaped buffers to the highway, I do not consider that the appeal proposal would give rise to harm to the street scene in this regard. Additionally, whilst the proposed extension would be sited close to the footway, I am not convinced that it would not be overbearing or dominant for pedestrians.
7. The appeal proposal would not therefore give rise to unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal does not conflict with Leeds City Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2014 Policy P10, which is concerned with design including that the size, scale, design and layout of the development is appropriate to its context and respects the character and quality of surrounding buildings. The proposal also accords with Leeds Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006 saved Policy BD6 which states that all alterations and extensions should respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building and saved UDP Policy GP5 which includes that development proposals should resolve detailed planning considerations. Additionally, I do not consider that the proposal conflicts with the design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework. Whilst the proposal conflicts in part with the guidance set out in the HDG, I nevertheless find it acceptable.

Conditions

8. I have attached conditions in respect of timescale and have specified the approved plans to provide certainty. I have also attached a condition regarding external construction materials in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons and having considered all matters raised, I consider that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Lewis

INSPECTOR