



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2022

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3291748

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 Glenn Austwick against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/08974/FU, dated 1 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is a garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for a garage at Beech Cottage, Sunfield, Stanningley, Pudsey LS28 6DE in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/08974/FU dated 1 November 2021 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site location plan, M3220/01/001 REV E, M3220/01/002 REV E, M3220/01/101 REV E, M3220/04/101 REV E, M3220/04/102 REV E, M3220/04/201 REV E & M3220/04/301 REV E.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the proposal has been altered slightly from the application form to the decision notice. That on the application form, however, adequately describes the proposal and I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. The Officer report makes reference to trees and shrubbery on the site, however at the time of my site visit there was very little planting in place at the site. Further reference is made to other proposals at the site and I have been provided with details of its planning history.
4. A two storey front extension and single storey side extension were apparent at the site but a garage which appears to have been approved towards the northern part of the site was not present at the time of my visit.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and on the setting of the nearby grade II listed Longwood Hall.

Reasons

6. The dwelling at the site sits on a plot which is large in comparison to many within the immediately surrounding area. The character of the area is broadly residential, but to the south the area hosts a mix of residential and commercial buildings adjacent to the busy Bradford Road.
7. Nearby residential dwellings vary in their age and design, and outbuildings, including garages, are not uncommon features within the street scene.
8. The single garage, which would include a pitched roof in line with the appearance of existing buildings in the area would be set well down from the adjacent dwelling and would be tucked to its western side set down against other outbuildings close to the boundary on the adjoining plot.
9. The current open nature of the plot is somewhat at odds with the established densely developed and in some cases cramped urban grain of the area. The large plot can therefore accommodate further development. The appellant indicates that they no longer intend to develop a garage at the northern end of the plot for which they have planning approval. However, even accounting for that and the existing dwelling and its extensions, the proposal would not result in overdevelopment of the plot, given its large size.
10. The attractive grade II listed Longwood Hall is situated to the south west of the appeal site. I have paid special regard to the desirability of preserving its setting.
11. There is very limited inter-visibility between the appeal site and the building given the intervening terrace on the western side of West Grove Street. Further, the building and its attractive and detailed front and side elevations would most commonly be appreciated from Bradford Road. The visual characteristics of the setting to the rear of the building make only a very limited contribution to the significance of the listed building. For the above reasons, the proposal would have a neutral impact on the significance of the heritage asset and would therefore preserve the setting of Longwood Hall.
12. In conclusion, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would preserve the setting of Longwood Hall.
13. Subsequently, the proposal would accord with policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds Core Strategy (2019) (CS) and saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006). Amongst other things, these policies require proposals of good design which preserve the setting of heritage assets.
14. The proposal would also accord with SPD¹ guidance which at HDG1 requires that all extensions, additions and alterations should respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.

¹ Leeds City Council Householder Design Guide Leeds Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document April 2012.

Conditions

15. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three-year time limit. It is necessary that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. A condition requiring matching materials is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

16. Taking all relevant matters into account, the proposal accords with the development plan and there is no indication that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore allowed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR