



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2020

by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3249960

1 Broadcroft Way, West Ardsley, Wakefield WF3 1TT

- 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 Lever against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00382/FU, dated 20 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension, conversion of garage to habitable room with raised decking area to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property and area.

Reasons

3. Located on the corner of Broadcroft Way and Constable Road, the property is a 2 storey detached house, constructed from red brick with a dual pitched tiled roof. It is located on a residential estate in a suburban area.
4. The proposal is for a single storey side extension, along with raised decking and a garage conversion. The Council has no objections to the decking or garage conversion. I agree. The property has been previously extended with a 2 storey side extension that the proposal would attach to, projecting towards the boundary with Constable Road.
5. The proposal would result in the overall width of extensions being greater than the original modest sized dwelling. I acknowledge that the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (April 2012) (SPD) details as a general rule of thumb extensions to the side of a house should be no greater than two thirds of the width of the main house. However, in this instance the original property was very modest in size and set on a large plot. It is also set within a street of large detached properties and would be single storey. Therefore, in this context, the scale would not appear overly disproportionate or uncharacteristic in relation to the overall appearance of the house and its plot.
6. Owing to its location on the side, the extension would be noticeable when approaching from the north. However, there is a tall fence that runs along the boundary with Constable Road, followed by well-established landscaping in the

garden. Additionally, Constable Road contains very few front facing properties, resulting in there being tall boundary treatments, comprising both walls and fencing, along most of the road. Indeed, these are prevalent at both the appeal property and 2 Broadcroft Way, with only low-level treatments forward of the building line. Furthermore, whilst the single storey height would project marginally above the fence, it would only abut the boundary at its north eastern corner, owing to the oblique fence line returning away from the boundary parallel with the side wall of the dwelling. It would also be set back from the front wall, leaving the entrance to the site open. Therefore, the siting of the proposal would also be acceptable.

7. Nevertheless, and notwithstanding the above findings, the flat roof design with the lantern roof light would not be in keeping with the character of the existing property, and given its location to the side, it would be noticeable from public vantage points. Furthermore, in this instance, it is principally of concern because when approaching from the north down Constable Way, the property is at a lower land level, such that the unsympathetic roof design would be noticeably prominent. This would negatively impact the street scene and character of the host property. Additionally, although the appellant attempted to submit amended plans with the appeal detailing a pitched roof, I must consider the same proposal that the Council made its decision upon.
8. Consequently, although I have no concerns with the overall scale and location of the proposal, the roof design would be unacceptable in this context and it would have a detrimental effect upon the character and appearance of the area. This would conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (November 2014, amendments adopted September 2019) and saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (July 2006). Together, these seek to provide good, high quality design.
9. There would also be conflict with the SPD which sets out general principles under 'HDG1', seeking to ensure that all alterations respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality. Lastly, there would be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to achieve well designed places.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR