

**Report of the Chief Planning Officer**

***PLANS PANEL WEST***

**Date: 1 October 2009**

**Subject: APPLICATION 09/03049/FU – Part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension, two storey side extension to other side and single storey front extension to 64 Woodhall Lane, Pudsey, Leeds, LS28 5NY**

**APPLICANT**

Mr B Bajwa

**DATE VALID**

13<sup>th</sup> July 2009

**TARGET DATE**

7<sup>th</sup> September 2009

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

**Calverley & Pudsey**

☒

Ward Member consulted

**Specific Implications For:**

Equality and Diversity

☐

Community Cohesion

☐

Narrowing the Gap

☐

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**GRANT planning permission, subject to the following conditions:**

Conditions

- (i) Time limit: 3 years
- (ii) Matching materials
- (ii) External walls and roofing to match existing

**Reasons for approval**

The application is considered to comply with policies GP5, BD6, T2 and LD1 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan(Review) 2006, not cause harm to the character of the host dwelling or wider area, nor to residential amenity and having regard to all other material considerations, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable.

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The application is brought to Plans Panel due to the level of interest from neighbouring residents, the Chief Planning Officer and Councillor Andrew Carter.

## **2.0 PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The application relates to the addition of a two storey rear extension to the property. This extension is proposed to be 8.3 metres in width, 4.3 metres in projection forming an enlarged family room with bedrooms above. In addition to this the applicant seeks to extend 7.5 metres at two storey level to the eastern elevation of the host property, at two storey level, replacing the existing detached garage with an integral double garage and kitchen with master bedroom above. The applicant further seeks permission to extend at two storey level to the western elevation of the host with this element of the proposed extensions being 5.6 metres in length and projecting 4.5 metres, with no projection beyond the west outer elevation of the existing dwelling. A canopy area is proposed to link this proposed side extension with the proposed rear extension at the southern most point of the expanded dwelling. The application also includes a modest forward projection to the front doorway. The proposal will increase the numbers of bedrooms from 4 to 6, one of which is for a disabled person on the ground floor.
- 2.2 As part of the submitted application, the applicant also sought permission for a stone boundary wall with pillars. This element of the proposal was removed from the application at the request of the applicant with officers unwilling to support the wall in terms of visual amenity and it being the subject of a valid enforcement notice.

## **3.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:**

- 3.1 The application relates to a detached house of stone and render construction which has a complex roof form but is predominantly hipped and of tile construction. The dwellings also features a flat roofed detached garage offset to the east of the host. The property as existing retains generous distances to the eastern and southern boundaries. There are large gardens to all sides with several mature trees forming the outer boundary to the site. The property is on a prominent corner. Although the street scene is mixed the property is of similar height to nearby dwellings, where the dominant feature is for large houses to retain a large garden area to at least one side and to be bounded by either natural planting or natural planting and modest walling.

## **4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:**

### **Planning Applications**

08/02917/FU - Part single storey extension with balcony over and part two storey side and rear extension. Two storey extension to other side. New raised roof with rooms in roof space and open porch to front forming 12 bedroom dwelling house. 1.9m high wall with 1m inset railings, pillars and new gates to boundary. This application was refused permission on 15 July 2008.

## **Appeals**

APP/N4720/A/09/2094419 – relating to the above planning application was dismissed 7<sup>th</sup> May 2009. The Inspector considered that the original house would have been subsumed and made unrecognisable by the proposed extensions and that part of the proposal was unacceptably disproportionate in scale. He did note that the area is characterised by large house in large plots which are similar in scale and mass to the proposal. He thought that the bulk of the dwelling would not be out of place in the area. However, he was concerned about the massing along Woodhall Lane and the loss of spaciousness that this part of the proposal created. He considered that the future health of trees covered by a TPO would be severely threatened by part of the scheme. He thought that the solid sections of the boundary wall detracted from the character and appearance of the area. He concluded that the proposal detracted from the character and appearance of the area.

## **Enforcement Cases**

08/00498/UHD3 – Unauthorised erection of wall - Pending

### **5.0 HISTORY OF NEGOTIATIONS:**

#### **5.1 Pre application discussions – September 2008 – June 2009**

Following officer consultation with the Design officer and Area Planning Manager, the applicant was advised that in order to address the reasons for the previous refusal, the applicant should demonstrate a proposed set of extensions that had a lesser impact upon the street scene through utilising the available space to the rear of the dwelling, with the previously refused application involving a large two storey extension to the western side of the host dwelling, which was considered out of keeping with the character of dwellings in the area.

#### **5.2 Application process – August 2009 - present**

The application under consideration originally included a proposal to retain the existing boundary wall, which was built without the benefit of planning permission and is the subject of an enforcement case. The applicant was advised the wall was not considered acceptable in respect of the character of the host dwelling and wider area and afforded the opportunity to revise the application and remove this wall from the application description. The application was amended to remove this feature on 28<sup>th</sup> August 2009, with the applicant stating by letter that they were considering removing the wall as a result of pending enforcement action.

### **6.0 PUBLIC/LOCAL RESPONSE:**

#### **6.1 4 letters of objection have been received from the general public and on behalf of the Woodhall and Rockwood Residents Association. A letter of objection has also been received from Councillor Andrew Carter concerned about the size of the extension. Neighbours have expressed the following concerns in respect of material planning considerations.**

The occupants of 4 Rockwood Road express concerns regarding scale, the boundary wall (which no longer forms part of the application under appraisal) and overlooking.

Woodhall and Rockwood Residents Association object with respect to the overall scale of development and the appearance of the boundary wall.

The occupants of 54 Woodhall Lane object to the proposal on the basis that their property does not appear on plan, also objecting to the overall scale of development, overlooking, and the protection of trees plus the appearance of the boundary wall.

The occupants of 34 Woodhall Croft object to the proposal in respect of the proposed scale of development, noise, the loss of the buildings original character and the character of the area and the visual impact of the property when viewed from their garden.

## **7.0 CONSULTATIONS RESPONSES:**

Landscape Team – No objection.

## **8.0 PLANNING POLICIES:**

### Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review) 2006

Seeks to ensure that development proposals resolve detailed planning considerations, including amenity.

### Policy BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review) 2006

All alterations and extensions should respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building

### Policy LD1 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review) 2006

Relates to the preservation of trees and other vegetation, seeking to ensure existing trees are retained in a healthy condition.

### Planning Policy Statement 1

Delivering Sustainable Development (PPS1) sets out the Government's overarching planning policies on the delivery of sustainable development through the planning system.

## **9.0 MAIN ISSUES**

Streetscene/design and character  
Privacy  
Overshadowing/Dominance  
Parking provision/Highway Safety  
Protected Trees

## 10.0 APPRAISAL

### 10.1 Streetscene / design and character

The extensions will be constructed of materials to match the host dwelling, namely a combination of stone with render facing, which will be controlled by condition in the event of an approval.

The previously refused application (08/02917/FU) was the subject of an appeal (APP/N4720/A/09/2094419) with the Inspector commenting that the original property would be '*subsumed*' and '*made unrecognisable*' by the proposed extensions. The application now under appraisal features a substantially more broken up roof form, retaining existing roof structures with no part of the proposal exceeding the height of the existing front gable.

The application site is a substantially sized plot measuring approximately 1660 square metres within an area of predominantly detached dwellings, many of which in the immediate locality are of substantial scale and within garden areas of less generous dimensions than the application site in question.

Within the appeal decision, the inspector also noted that the bulk of the extensions (as refused) '*would not look out of place in this area*' but could not be considered acceptable due to the proposed proximity of extensions to Woodhall Lane, with a resulting loss of the sense of spaciousness along this part of the lane and Rockwood Road.

The application under appraisal no longer projects towards the western boundary of the site with Woodhall Lane, instead projecting 8.1 metres to the eastern side where the dwelling benefits from more expansive garden space, retaining 17 metres to the eastern boundary and between 8-21 metres to the southern boundary.

The applicant has proposed a far more broken up form than the previous application, with western outer elevation including both double and single storey elements, the retention of elements of the existing room form, including the front gable end and the loss of unsympathetic features such as the raised rear balcony area and front archway on pillars proposed under 08/02917/FU.

The existing form of the property when viewed from the corner of Rockwood Road and Woodhall Lane remains the dominant visual feature with additional two storey mass either set back from the front of the dwelling or situated to the rear. The outer projection of the extension to the eastern boundary is a nominal 400mm beyond the outer projection of the existing side garage and although two storey mass is now proposed at this point where once a single storey structure stood, the additional 400mm projection is not considered harmful in respect of the host properties' relationship to this side boundary.

The proposed rear extension is set within the site, with only limited viewpoints of this feature afforded from the west of the site thanks to the level of planting and trees to this outer side adjacent to Woodhall Lane. The rear of the application site is subject to high sided boundary treatment which will obscure the bulk of the extension from the view of the dwelling at 54 Woodhall Lane.

Thus; it is considered that the proposal will not be out of keeping as it will not have an unduly detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the original property or the present streetscene.

## 10.2 Privacy

The proposed rear extension features two windows at first floor level with 14 metres retained to the rear boundary at this point, a boundary which is protected by high sided coniferous planting as such not to afford the applicant a viewpoint of existing dwellings in close proximity. SPG13 – ‘Neighborhoods for Living’ suggests 7.5 metres as an acceptable distance in such circumstances, but this figure should be understood as guidance only.

The proposed side extension, to the eastern side of the dwelling, features one first floor window facing south, to which at least 14 metres are retained to the southern (rear) and eastern (side) boundaries.

Two first floor windows are proposed to the west side elevation of the proposed extensions to which a minimum of 11 metres are retained to the southern boundary and 15 metres to the western boundary, affording a viewpoint of the public highway rather than neighbouring dwellings at this point.

Proposed ground floor windows afford the applicant no extra ability to overlook, with the application site and surroundings featuring no substantial changes in levels and with boundary treatments of sufficient height to prevent overly advantageous outlooks

It is therefore considered that the proposal will not result in any significant overlooking of any neighbouring properties or private amenity space. Thus; the proposal will not be detrimental to the privacy of any neighbouring occupants.

## 10.3 Overshadowing / dominance

The proposed rear extension is of two storey height. However, the rear elevation of the proposed two storey rear extension retains 9-21 metres to the rear boundary of the site. The potential for impact upon neighbour amenity is further lessened by the high sided coniferous planting which forms the boundary treatment to the southern boundary. With respect to the side extension, a distance of between 12-17 metres is retained to the eastern boundary of the application site. As such, it is considered that no significant loss of light or over-dominance of either of the adjacent properties will occur as a result of the proposed two storey side and rear extensions.

The proposed two storey side or rear extensions are not considered to have a detrimental impact on highway safety or parking at the site. The proposal includes a large integral garage suitable for the storage of two vehicles with space for further cars on the existing driveway to the front of the dwelling. It is therefore considered that the domestic car parking provision at the dwelling will exceed the recommended two off-street car parking spaces per dwelling. Thus; the proposal is unlikely to result in further on-street parking within the locality, which would be detrimental to highway safety.

#### 10.4 Protected trees

On the refusal of the appeal against application 08/02917/FU the inspector noted that *'Part of the western extension would be constructed very close to at least two trees that are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. In my opinion, the future health and development of these trees would be severely threatened by the development. Their loss in their own right would be severely detrimental to the visual amenity of this part of the streetscene which has a verdant appearance'*

The application under appraisal features no outward projection of built mass towards these trees with the applicant instead seeking to exploit the more expansive areas of developable space to the eastern side and rear of the application site.

A consultation with the Landscape Team has yielded no objection to the proposals in respect of protected trees situated to the western boundary of the application site.

#### 11.0 CONCLUSION

- 11.1 For the reasons outlined in the above report and taking into account all other material considerations it is recommended that planning permission should be approved subject to the aforementioned conditions.

#### **Background Papers:**

Application file 08/02917/FU

Inspector's decision APP/N4720/A/09/2094419 dated 7<sup>th</sup> May 2009

Spg13 – 'Neighbourhoods for Living'

4 letters of objection

Letter from Councillor Andrew Carter



# WEST PLANS PANEL



Scale 1 / 1000

PRODUCED BY COMMUNICATIONS, GRAPHICS & MAPPING, LEEDS CITY COUNCIL  
 This map is based upon the Ordnance Survey's Digital data with the permission of the Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.  
 (c) Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.  
 (c) Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Leeds City Council O.S. Licence No. - 100019567

