
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2020 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/19/3240006

8 The Oval, Farsley, Pudsey, Leeds, LS28 5FH

- 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 Faulkner against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/04569/FU, dated 22 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension to dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 8 The Oval and the local area.

Reasons

4. 8 The Oval is a modern, detached property situated towards the end of a cul-de-sac which forms part of a larger residential development. The area has a spacious 'open plan' character and its appearance is informed by the regularity in the design and layout of the dwellings. Properties, including No 8, generally have a simple rectangular form with a double gabled feature at the front. No 8 lies adjacent to a turning area.
5. The proposal is for a two-storey extension at the rear of the property and a single-storey extension to the side.
6. The rear extension would be wider than the existing building and as such would not be consistent with the form or design of the property. Although the height of the proposed extension would be stepped and lower than that of the host dwelling, the roof pitch itself would be shallower than that of the existing roof making it appear awkward. In addition, whilst gables are a characteristic feature of the dwellings in the area, the proposal would result in a complicated roof form which is out of character with the host dwelling.

7. Furthermore, the development, particularly the side extension, would reduce the space between the side of the dwelling and the highway and as such the extended dwelling would appear cramped on its plot. As such it would be at odds with the spacious character of the wider area.
8. Due to the location of the property adjacent to turning area, where there is a slightly wider gap between dwellings, the development would be visible in the street scene. I recognise that passing traffic would be limited but nevertheless, this does not justify the proposal before me.
9. I note that the proposed extension would be constructed in matching materials and that an area of private garden would be retained. These factors would not outweigh the harm identified to the character and appearance of the area.
10. The appellant has brought to my attention previously approved extensions in the vicinity of the site, in particular at 12 The Oval. From my observations on the site visit, the extension, and location of the property within the street scene are not directly comparable to this proposal, so has limited weight in my assessment. In any event, I have determined this appeal on the site specific circumstances of this case.
11. For the reasons set out above the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the local area, and would therefore conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (2014), saved Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006), Policy HDG1 of the Leeds Householder Design Guide (2012) and para 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which together seek to ensure that developments are of high quality and are sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

12. In reaching my decision I have had full regard to the personal circumstances that have given rise to the need for the proposal. Whilst I am sympathetic to this need, I do not consider that it outweighs the harm I have identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the support from neighbouring residents, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR