The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by Helen Hockenhull BA(Hons) B.Pl MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/16/3162224
46 Valley Road, Pudsey LS28 9ER

- 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 P Canavan against the decision of Leeds City Council.
- The application Ref 16/05578/FU, dated 6 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2016.
- The development proposed is a single storey front extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The original planning application form describes the development as a single storey extension to the rear. The Appeal Form at Question E does not indicate that the description has been changed however it is stated that the development proposed is a front extension. It is clear to me following my site visit that the extension is to the front of the property. I have therefore described the scheme as such in the heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property forms a small end terraced stone cottage. It is sited in an unusual position with the terrace forming an 'L' shape around a small yard area which the properties all overlook. The dwellings are constructed in stone with a slate roof and have a uniformity of design with small flat facades.

5. The appeal proposes a single storey front extension creating a porch and bay window. The porch element projects forward of the existing front elevation by around 2.5 metres with a width of approximately 1.8 metres.

6. Core Strategy Policy P10 requires new development to provide good design that is appropriate to its location, scale and function. The policy goes on to say that new development should respect and enhance existing streets according to local distinctiveness and wider setting of the place. Saved Policies BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) have similar objectives and also promote good design. In addition the Council's

Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012(SPD) advises in Policy HDG1 that all extensions additions and alterations should respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality. The SPD also provides guidance on front extensions. It recognises that they are often difficult to accommodate as the front part of the house is the most visible and prominent and has a key role in defining its character and that of the street.

7. In this case the terrace properties neighbouring the appeal site have simple small frontages with no existing front extensions. The appeal proposal would introduce such an extension which would appear out of place against the uniformity and simple character of the neighbouring dwellings. I acknowledge that the proposal is relatively modest in scale. However when viewed against the small front elevation of the appeal property, and having regard to the close relationship of the neighbouring terrace properties, it would create a significant front projection which would dominate the front elevation.

8. Whilst I accept that the siting of the terrace is unique and therefore does not present a typical street scene, the principles of the SPD should still be applied. I consider that the front extension would form an incongruous addition which would not respect the scale, form, proportion, character and appearance of the terrace group.

9. In summary I consider that the appeal proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would fail to comply with Core Strategy Policy P10, Saved UDP Policies BD6 and GP5, Policy HDG1 of the Council's Householder Design Guide as well as the design objectives of Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Other matters

10. I note that neighbouring residents have expressed concern with regard to loss of light and overshadowing as a result of the proposed extension. The Council considers the scheme to be acceptable in this regard and I have no reason based on the evidence before me to take a different view.

11. The appellant has suggested in his statement that the Council has ignored the advice in paragraphs 186 and 187 of the Framework that local planning authorities should look for solutions rather than problems and should seek to approve sustainable development where possible. I note that the scheme had been revised and reduced in size during the application process to address the initial concerns of the Council. This suggests to me that the Council has tried to resolve the issues raised by the development. In any event this matter is not one upon which I am required to comment further.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I dismiss this appeal.

Helen Hockenhull INSPECTOR