
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2023

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3324710

16 White Rose Way, Garforth, Leeds LS25 2EF

- 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 Nicholas Baldwin against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/02215/FU, dated 6 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is build additional bedroom above garage, by extending the existing dormer style roof across and replacing the existing roof with a structural floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. White Rose Way is in the main dominated by semi-detached dormer style bungalows, which are reasonably limited in bulk by reason of their design.
4. The effect of this is that the street has a reasonably spacious feel due to their limited bulk, and the gaps which fall between these properties allowing views from the street through to rear gardens/trees and the sky beyond.
5. The existing garage to the side of the dwelling sits only a very short distance from the boundary and the extension would rise above this feature. Given that the set off from the boundary would be minimal, there would be little opportunity for any views through to the rear and the street would feel more enclosed as a result.
6. I appreciate that the gap between the appeal property and No.18 White Rose Way to the south-east would not be completely closed at two storey level as there is only a garage to the side of that neighbouring property.
7. However, allowing this appeal would likely make it harder for the Council to resist such development elsewhere on the street for the same house type. If repeated this would have a progressively more harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area through the enclosure of the street and the terracing effect.

8. There would be clear conflict with the SPD¹, particularly in the sense that it advises that in a street of regular semi-detached dwellings, at least a 1.0m gap should be maintained to the side boundary. This could not be provided. The lack of a set down and set back would compound the harm identified above through the additional bulk that this would bring to the proposal.
9. Whilst there is mixed colour cladding within the wider area, that within this section of the street is rather uniform in colour, and departing from this would be likely to draw attention to the property, further compounding the harm.
10. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy P10 of the Core Strategy Selective Review (2019) which amongst other things requires that development respects the character and quality of an area. Further, the proposal would conflict with Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) which amongst other things require resolution on design issues and that alterations and extensions respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building.
11. The proposal would conflict with Policy HDG1 of the SPD which requires that extensions, additions and alterations respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and locality.

Other Matters

12. My attention has been drawn to other extensions within the area. Those at 1 Bar Lane and 28 White Rose Way however are not directly comparable given that they are corner properties that by reason of their orientation allow more space to the sides of the dwellings. That at 11 White Rose Way is somewhat of an anomaly, in flat roof form, but is not directly comparable given it is set well down from the ridgeline.
13. I also appreciate that the appellant requires additional space to grow their family. This is a matter to which I have afforded positive weight. However, the harm identified would outweigh this and the Council does have clear published guidelines with regard to the design acceptability of two storey side extensions.

Conclusion

14. There are no material considerations to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR

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