
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2019

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/19/3230737

10 Acres Road, Lofthouse, Wakefield WF3 3NU

- 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 J Horton against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01732/FU, dated 10 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 May 2019
 - The development proposed is two storey and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - a) the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area; and
 - b) the living conditions of the occupants of 8 Acres Road and 12 Acres Road, particularly in relation to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a modest, two storey mid-terrace house located within a small cul-de-sac. To the rear is a single storey, flat roofed extension. It is located within a mainly residential area, which sits on the edge of open countryside, and there is a wide variety of house types in the area.
4. The roof of the appeal property has lower eaves to the rear. In order to achieve the required internal space, the proposed first floor is designed to be higher than the existing eaves level extending the wall into the roof slope. The resulting eaves level of the extension, although designed with some reference to the next-door eaves at 12 Acres Road, would sit awkwardly against the low eaves of the existing rear elevation of the house. The hipped pitched roof would also not be characteristic of the property and would further accentuate the awkward relationship between the two. The form and proportions of the extension would make it a prominent and incongruous feature in views from adjacent properties and from Westgate Lane where the extension would be visible.
5. Consequently, due to the extension's form, scale and design I find that it would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area and as such

would be contrary to Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy adopted November 2014 which seeks to achieve high quality design, Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006), Policy HGD1 of the Leeds Local Development Framework (UDP), Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document April 2012 (SPD), and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which collectively seek to ensure new development complements or improves the character of the area and harmonises with the scale, form and proportions of the original building and the street scene.

Living conditions

6. The new ground floor projection would be similar to the existing extension. Although the change to a pitched roof would add a small amount of mass to the ground floor this would not be significant. The projection at first floor is approximated, according to the drawings, at 1.6 metres. 8 Acres Road is a similar design to the appeal property. It has windows in the main rear elevation set in from the joint boundary. The mass of the two-storey structure is set away from the joint boundary and, although the orientation of the properties would impose a small amount of additional shading to the rear of 8 Acres Road there would be limited impact on the outlook from windows. Further, while the extension would be seen from the rear of No 8 and its garden, due to its form and position the extension would not appear dominant.
7. The first-floor rear elevation of 12 Acres Road is set back from the rear elevation of the appeal property. The addition of the first-floor extension would introduce further built development at two storeys on the joint boundary. However, the orientation of the properties is such that there would be no loss of light. The closest window to the boundary at first floor is already set behind the side wall of the appeal property. While the proposed first floor extension would result in some further reduction in the outlook from this window it would not be so great as to affect the living conditions of the occupiers to an unacceptable degree. Further, the rear projection is sufficiently limited to prevent the extension from dominating the adjacent spaces.
8. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed extension would not harm the living conditions of 8 Acres Road and 12 Acres Road with regard to outlook and light. I therefore find no conflict with the provisions of Policy GP5 of the UDP and Policy HDG2 of the SPD and paragraph 130 of the Framework, all of which seek to safeguard the amenity of neighbours.

Other Matters

9. I appreciate that the extension would improve the living conditions for the occupiers of the property, that the scheme is a revised scheme which has reduced the projection of the first-floor extension and that there are no objections to the development from either of the immediate neighbours. However, these matters do not outweigh my findings in respect of the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. I have found that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. Whilst I have found that there would be no adverse effects to the living conditions of 8 Acres Road and 12 Acres

Road in respect of outlook and light, this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified to character and appearance. Therefore, taking into account all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR