



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 23 November 2021

by Katherine Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/21/3282039

36 Crawshaw Avenue, Pudsey LS28 7BT

- 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 Tim and Karen Thomson against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04823/FU, dated 28 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of garage and erection of new garage with home office at family dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area including the setting of Pudsey Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located at the end of Crawshaw Avenue which is characterised by traditional terraced and semi-detached stone houses set back from the highway behind short front gardens with longer gardens to the rear. It and its neighbour at 38 Crawshaw Avenue are modern detached houses accessed via a shared driveway at the end of the Avenue. The appeal site lies outside but immediately adjacent to the boundary of Pudsey Conservation Area (CA).
4. The CA is typified by buildings which contributed to Pudsey's industrial development during the 1800s and early 1900s. The Avenue lies within Character Area 5 (Southern Domestic Development) of the CA Character Appraisal¹. This part of the CA is characterised by late 19th Century and early 20th Century terraced rows and semi-detached houses built of locally quarried sandstone and millstone grit.
5. The appeal property is hidden from longer views and only reveals itself towards the end of the Avenue. The gap between the front elevation of the appeal property and the boundary of 34 Crawshaw Avenue provides an important distinction between the terraced properties which lie within the CA and the appeal property which lies outside it and therefore makes a positive

¹ Pudsey Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan - Leeds City Council April 2009

- contribution to the setting of the CA. The CA Character Appraisal identifies the buildings on the Avenue as being positive features within the CA.
6. The front elevation of the appeal property and No 38 are broadly in line with each other and together form a strong building line which reflects the general character and layout of the houses on the Avenue. As a pair they are, however, substantially larger than the houses that surround them.
 7. The proposal comprises a single storey double width garage with a pitched roof linked by a flat roofed element to the front elevation of the house. The proposed extension would project forwards of the front elevation by over 10 metres. The scale and design of the proposed extension would therefore appear as an overly dominant addition to the front elevation of the house taking up a substantial proportion of the front garden and existing driveway detrimental to the character and proportions of the appeal property. It would not appear as subservient to the appeal property, rather it would dominate the frontage of the house.
 8. This gap currently provides breathing space between the appeal property and the Avenue. Due to the scale and footprint of the forward extension this gap in built form would be all but removed. Moreover, the proximity of the extension to the boundary with No 34 would mean that the gable end of the garage would appear as an unduly dominant feature when viewed from the rear gardens of this side of the Avenue.
 9. For these reasons the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area contrary to saved policies GP5 and BD6 of the Unitary Development Plan, Policy P10 of the Leeds Local Development Framework Core Strategy (Core Strategy). I have also had due regard to Policy HDG1 of the supplementary planning guidance 'Householder Design Guide', which adds weight to my conclusions. Together these policies seek to protect the character and appearance of a locality through high quality design that respects local design features. The proposal would also be contrary to a core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') which in relation to new development, seeks to secure high quality design.
 10. In considering the effect of the proposal on the CA's setting the impact must be weighed against the harm it would have on the heritage asset as a whole. In this case, the potential for any adverse impact on the CA, would be confined to the immediate locality of the Avenue. This would amount to less than substantial harm to the setting of the CA within the meaning of paragraph 199 of the Framework and I must attach considerable weight to that harm.
 11. Having applied the test set out in paragraph 202 of the Framework I consider that the benefits of the development are private relating to alterations to domestic accommodation. Accordingly, I find that there would be no public benefit to offset the identified harm. The proposal is consequently in conflict with Policy P11 of the Core Strategy and the Framework in this respect.

Other Matters

12. I have noted the personal circumstances of the appellant and have given this matter careful consideration. However, there is no evidence before me which leads me to believe that the appeal proposal is the only means of providing

accommodation necessary to the health needs of the appellant and this does not outweigh the harm that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

13. My attention has also been drawn to other examples of front extensions in the wider Leeds area which have been allowed on appeal. However, I do not have the full details of these cases before me and in any event, I must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits. These are not matters that would lead me to a different view in this case.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and having considered the development plan as a whole and all relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Katherine Robbie

INSPECTOR