



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2023

by P Storey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3315424

2 Cropstones, Bramham, Leeds, Wetherby LS23 6SG

- 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 K Mercer against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/07237/FU, dated 27 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side extension at 2 Cropstones, Bramham, Leeds, Wetherby LS23 6SG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/07237/FU, dated 27 October 2022, 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 following approved plans, only insofar as they relate to the development as described for a single storey side extension:

Location Plan scale 1:1250

Site Plans – Drawing No. Mercer-03 rev.D

Proposed Plans & Elevations – Drawing No. Mercer-12
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site is within the Bramham Conservation Area (the CA). Accordingly, the statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) applies, which requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.
3. The submitted plans illustrate a single-storey rear extension that has previously been approved but, at the time of my visit, was not yet built. The submitted drawings clearly label the approved extension, thus distinguishing it from the extension before me. For the avoidance of doubt, my determination of

this appeal is based solely on the proposed single-storey side extension, as set out in the application form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

Reasons

5. The CA is focussed on the historic core of Bramham village which comprises of narrow intertwined streets and many traditional stone buildings, some of which date back hundreds of years. The historic core has a fine grain, with varied front building lines and many buildings sitting directly on the roadside.
6. The Bramham Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (the BCAAMP) identifies the appeal site as being within a sub-area defined as Character Area 2 – 'The 20th Century'. This character area is formed predominantly of relatively modern housing development with a more spacious character than that found in the historic core. The significance of the CA is derived predominantly from the traditional layout and appearance of streets and buildings in the historic core, and also the contribution made by more modern development to provide housing that reflects the values of the historic core whilst retaining a more spacious setting.
7. The appeal site sits within a residential estate formed of small cul-de-sacs and a range of detached, semi-detached and terraced houses, predominantly constructed of traditional materials including stone walls and red pantile roofs that reflect many of the older buildings in the historic core. The BCAAMP defines the appeal site as a 'positive building', which makes a positive contribution to the CA.
8. Due to its prominent location on a corner, the front and rear elevations are visible from the street. Although the existing single-storey porch and side projection is partially screened from the side by a tall mature hedgerow, its roof remains clearly visible above this and from the rear, where there are currently no boundary treatments.
9. Whilst there is a degree of uniformity in the overall design and layout of neighbouring dwellings, there are numerous examples of design details specific to individual dwellings, principally in the form of single-storey porches and offshoots. These features generally utilise the same palette of materials, and whilst it is not possible to ascertain whether they all comprise original features, they appear as inclusive elements of the streetscene. In this context, the semi-detached host property includes a front porch and single storey side projection that appears different to what is found on its adjoining pair, although both dwellings use the same palette of materials. This variation in the scale and appearance of certain elements of the buildings results in a general lack of symmetry, and is a characteristic feature of the area that reflects the variation in detailing found in the historic core of the CA.
10. Whilst the proposed development would extend no further forward than the existing porch and side projection, it would extend further sideways and upwards, and would stretch along the full side elevation of the house. As such, it would become more prominent in the streetscene. However, it would utilise similar materials to the existing dwelling, have a similar roof pitch and would

not appear disproportionate, particularly in the context of the variety found in the streetscene. The increased height would be more visible than the existing extension, but it would still be viewed as a subservient addition to the main dwelling that would reflect the nature of surrounding development.

11. Although the proposed development would extend the side building line closer to the highway edge, it would retain a reasonable separation to the boundary. The side building line, both as existing and as proposed, does not relate directly to any adjacent building lines. Furthermore, the proposed development would retain a significantly greater separation from the highway edge than at some neighbouring properties. The plans indicate that the existing mature hedge would be retained, and whilst this would be desirable it would not be determinative to my decision. I am also mindful that the retention of the hedge cannot be guaranteed. As such, even if the hedge was removed, I am satisfied that the proposed development would lead to no adverse effects on the character or appearance of the surrounding area.
12. When considering the impact of proposed development on the significance of designated heritage assets, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), requires great weight to be placed on the asset's conservation. Even when giving great weight to the conservation of the CA, I have identified no harm to its significance.
13. For the above reasons, the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. As such, it would accord with Policies P10, P11 and P12 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) Leeds Local Plan, Policies GP5, N19 and N25 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) Volume 1: Written Statement, and Policy H3 of the Bramham cum Oglethorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan 2018-2033. Together these policies seek, among other objectives, for new development to deliver high quality inclusive design, for the historic environment to be conserved and enhanced, for the character and quality of townscapes to be conserved and enhanced, for development to avoid environmental intrusion and loss of amenity, and for boundaries of sites to be designed in an appropriate manner. It would also accord with the provisions of the Framework and the guidance in the BCAAMP, which has similar aims.

Conditions

14. Conditions relating to the statutory time limit and a list of approved plans are necessary in the interests of clarity. I have specified in the approved plans condition that the development permitted relates only to that as described in the application form, on the basis that the plans also show the previously approved rear extension which does not form part of the proposed development. A condition requiring the external materials to match those of the existing building is also necessary in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions previously listed.

P Storey

INSPECTOR