
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2019

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/19/3234306

Beech Cottage, Sunfield, Stanningley, Pudsey LS28 6DE

- 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 & Mrs Austwick against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02326/FU, dated 14 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2019 .
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I note that the application form refers to a two-storey side extension and single storey front extension, whereas the appeal form and the council's decision notice refers only to a two-storey side extension. I have used the description from the appeal form as the scheme does not propose a single storey extension. I also note that the extension is to the front elevation whereas the appeal form refers to the extension as being on the side. Whilst I have left the description unchanged in this respect to be consistent with the description used by the appellant and the Council, I have noted the orientation of the property in coming to my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Sunfield is part of a mainly residential area with a wide variety of house types set in a range of plot sizes. Although the area has a mix of development, within this variety there are a number of features that particularly add to its character and appearance. These features are derived mainly from the character of the older buildings with their stone work, natural roof materials, mainly simple gable roof form and chimneys.
5. The appeal site is set back from the road frontage and, together with its neighbour, presents a side gable wall to Sunfield. Although there are a number of extensions to the property at ground floor level, including a double garage attached to the side gable, the upper part of the building including the roof

line, the chimneys and the materials of construction are part of the important characteristics I have described.

6. The proposed two storey extension would project out from the front elevation of the house. As a consequence of the design, the extended dwelling would be re-orientated to face Sunfield. The siting, scale and mass of the extension would be disproportionate to and overwhelm the existing house. Further, it would influence the design of the refurbishment of the original structure in a way that would diminish its character. The overall effect of the scheme would be to unacceptably detract from the modest character and appearance of the host building.
7. In addition, the extension's design, because of its projection and substantial hipped roof, would significantly diminish the appearance of the shared side gable wall. It would unbalance the appearance of the appeal property when seen in relation to its attached neighbour in a manner that would be unsympathetic. The gable wall is visible from Sunfield and the proposed extension would be evident from here and would detract from the area's character and appearance.
8. At my site visit I noted that the side elevation of the property facing West Grove Street is highly visible. From this vantage point the side wall of the proposed extension would appear as a substantial unrelieved mass. Together, the bulk of the building, the lack of definition between the existing building and the proposed development and the large area of unrelieved stonework would dominate views from the end of West Grove Street to the detriment of the appearance of the host property and the street scene.
9. Therefore, I conclude that the extension would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and would conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds Local Development Framework Core Strategy November 2014 and saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) and the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document April 2012. These policies collectively seek to ensure that development respects the design detail of existing buildings and the area. The policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework with which the development also conflicts.

Other Matters

10. I note the appellant's view that there may be other development that would not need planning permission that could be erected at the appeal property. However, I have not been provided with any specific details of an alternative scheme to compare with the appeal development and there is no evidence before me of any realistic prospect that an alternative scheme would be implemented.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR