
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2022 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by Anne Jordan BA Hons MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3302896

1 Sandringham Avenue, Pudsey, LS28 9DE

- 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 Nigel Williams against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00520/FU, dated 22 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is double rear and side extension.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. During the planning application process, amended plans were received by the Council which were used by them to determine the application. I have similarly determined the appeal on the basis of these amended plans.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The host property is a detached dwelling in a residential area supporting a mix of house types. It is located in a prominent position at the junction of Sandringham Avenue and Valley Road with the single storey side elevation forming the back of the footway. This is relatively large but in keeping with other properties in the area has a pitched roof and so does not appear obtrusive or out of place.
6. 46a Valley Road is a grade II listed building on the opposite side of Valley Road, approximately 20 metres from the host property. The Council do not consider that the appeal proposal would harm the setting of the listed building. The property is a former school, since converted and has an inscribed stone lintel above the door. The significance of the asset lies in its historic use, which is evident in part in the inscription stone and the age and condition of parts of its fabric. It sits on the roadside in an area which has a range of building ages

and types. From my observations on the site visit, I am satisfied that the proposal would not appreciably alter this existing setting.

7. The proposal comprises a two rear extension which would extend across the width of the property. The existing property has a single storey converted garage at the side and the proposal replaces this with a part two storey, part one storey element that wraps around the building. This has a part flat roof, part catslide roof. From my observations there were no other examples of this type of roof design in the vicinity of the proposal.
8. When viewed from Valley Road the mix of rooflines – comprising a pitched gable, a flat roof and a catslide, would appear contrived and incongruous and would fail to assimilate comfortably into the streetscene. The awkward visual effect would be compounded by the size of the extension, which would extend up to the footway and so would be prominently visible for some distance in both directions along the road. In these views it would appear unduly dominant in the street scene and unsympathetic to the character of the area.
9. I conclude that the double rear and side extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. It would therefore fail to comply policy P10 of the Core Strategy (2019) and policies GP5 and BD6 of the Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) which together, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is appropriate to its location, is appropriate to its context and respects the character of the wider locality. It would also conflict with the guidance in the SPD, which states that extensions should respect the scale, form, proportions and character and appearance of the dwelling and locality with particular regard to roof form and line, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge the personal circumstances of the appellant and the need for additional living space to meet family needs and also that the appellant has amended to scheme in an attempt to overcome the objections of the Council. These matters attract some limited weight in favour of the proposal but do not overcome the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the area and host dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations that would outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR