



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2021 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MIEMA
CEnv MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/21/3279015

155 Wigton Lane, Alwoodley, Leeds LS17 8SH

- 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 J Rooprai against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/08509/FU, dated 18 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is front, rear and roof extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of three storey and single storey front extensions, incorporating gable wall extensions to both sides and rear with glazing to form new second floor, two dormer windows and single storey extension to rear and new first floor window to side at 155 Wigton Lane, Alwoodley, Leeds LS17 8SH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/08509/FU, dated 18 December 2020 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed: Drawing Nos. 19162-1 (Existing Plans and Elevations); 19162-3(Proposed Plans and Elevations); 19162-4 (Proposed Block Plan) and Location Plan.

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The application describes the proposal as previously granted under reference 17/03807/FU. However, the appeal proposal is materially different from this scheme.
4. The Council's decision describes the proposal as alterations including three storey and single storey front extensions, incorporating gable wall extensions to both sides and rear with glazing to form new second floor, two dormer windows and single storey extension to rear, new first floor window to side.

This gives a more comprehensive description of the proposal than that given on the application form and I have considered the appeal based on this description.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. No. 155 is a detached dwelling constructed in brick and stone with mansard roof located on the northern side of Wigton Lane in the Alwoodley area of Leeds. It comprises an integral garage, single storey front extension, two storey rear extension and a rear conservatory, and is sited on a large plot with a deep rear garden and double driveway at the front.
7. The surrounding area particularly on the northern side of the road is characterised by detached dwellings within sizeable plots in a variety of designs, shapes and form, scale, materials, and boundary materials. The evidence also indicates that a number of properties within the vicinity have been extended substantially over time. Some of those extensions incorporate contemporary designs and materials such as large areas of glazing as were observed at nos. 111 Wigton Lane, Wigton Court, Wigton Villa and Wigton Castle.
8. Policy HDG1 of Householder Design Guide Leeds City Council's Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (April 2012) (the 'SPD') states that all extensions, additions and alterations should respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality with particular attention should be paid to the roof form and roof line.
9. The scale of the proposed extensions would not be subservient to the original property and the appeal proposal would result in a significantly different design which would, in visual terms, be tantamount to constructing a different and much larger dwelling. As acknowledged by the Council the loss of the existing character of the property would not be unacceptable in principle, given the varied nature of the immediate street scene. There are also other properties of comparable massing and height which also include deep two-storey front extensions. Furthermore, properties are well set back from the road with no defined building line. Although the extended property would visually extend closer to the side boundaries, particularly at first floor level, the remaining gap to each side would be consistent with the prevailing pattern in the area. Therefore, although the proposal would not be subservient to the original dwelling, the proposal would not cause harm to the character of the area, on account of its increased scale, having regard to the established context.
10. In addition, the proportions of the property would not be unusual, with a balanced front elevation set either side of the projecting front gable. The mix of stone and render would respond to the palette of materials in the area and the contemporary element of tall glazing would not be out of place given the other examples referred to above. Consequently, notwithstanding that the proposal would fail to conform to some aspects of the guidance within the SPD, the

appeal proposal would adequately respond to the local context and would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

11. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with the objectives Policy P10 of Leeds City Council's Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) (the 'CS') and saved policies GP5 and BD6 of Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) (the 'UDP') and the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'NPPF') which seek amongst other things to ensure that size, scale, design and layout of a new development is appropriate to its context and respects the character and quality of surrounding buildings.

Other Matters

12. It is noted that the Council addressed a number of points raised by interested parties at the application stage and found that the proposal was acceptable in relation to its impact on neighbouring living conditions and highway safety. It also noted that an on-going dispute in relation to the height of trees along the boundary was not material to the application. Having viewed the proposal and its relationship with surrounding properties and the adjacent highway I see no reason to take a different view and am satisfied that the impact would be acceptable in those respects.

Conditions

13. I have considered the suggested conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the statutory commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall allow the appeal, subject to the recommended conditions.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR.