

Originator: Theo Matthew Tel: 0113 247 8000

Report of the Chief Planning Officer

PLANS PANEL WEST

Date: 15th April 2010

Subject: APPLICATION 09/03653/FU - Retrospective application for single storey rear extension at 54 Cliff Road, Woodhouse, Leeds, LS6 2EZ

APPLICANT Mr. & Mrs. A Burch	DATE VALID 21 st August 2009	TARGET DATE 16th October 2009
Electoral Wards Affected:		Specific Implications For:
Hyde Park & Woodhouse		Equality and Diversity
X Vard Members consulte referred to in report)	ed	Narrowing the Gap

1.0 **RECOMMENDATION:**

1.1 The application is subject to an appeal against non-determination. If the Local Planning Authority had been in a position to determine the application then it would have been minded to REFUSE the application under delegated powers for the following reason.

The Local Planning Authority considers that the extension by reason of its scale, materials and detailing has produced a discordant feature which is unsympathetic to the character of the host dwelling and terrace row to the detriment of the Conservation Area. As such it fails to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area and is contrary to policies N19, BC7, GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan(Review) 2006 and advice contained within PPS5 - 'Planning for the Historic Environment'.

2.0 PROPOSAL

It is not felt that the application can be supported for the reasons set out in the reason for refusal and in the appraisal section of this report.

2.2 The application is retrospective and relates to the construction of a single storey rear extension. It measures 4 metres deep by 4.23 metres wide and has a mono-pitched roof. Its maximum height is 4.16 metres and is 2.58 metres to the eaves. The extension has been constructed with a natural slate roof to match the existing roof with the side elevations formed from concrete block-work clad with horizontal Cedar boarding. It juts out 0.64 metres from the side wall of the house. It has three long narrow windows to the northern elevation and patio doors overlooking the garden.

3.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

3.1 The site is located within the Headingley Conservation Area. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, the property consists of a Victorian red brick end terrace house with a garden area to its rear that measures only 8 metres wide but some 53 metres long. Originally the property along with the dwellings that make up the rest of the terrace row, was one of two large houses that have been divided up into five separate houses c1890. The application site is flat and enclosed by brick walling, trees and shrubbery planting. There is an open boundary between this and the adjoining house. The townscape of Cliff Road is defined by a mix of large Victorian villas, detached houses and terrace houses and later semi-detached houses.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

None.

5.0 **HISTORY OF NEGOTIATIONS:**

None

6.0 **PUBLIC/LOCAL RESPONSE:**

6.1 Three letters of objection have been received. One is from the neighbouring household 53 Cliff Road with other comments from North Hyde Park Neighbourhood Association and Leeds Civic Trust. An email was also received from Councillor Ewen requesting that the planning application to be determined at plans panel.

The comments raised the following concerns:

- (i) Accuracy of measurements.
- (ii) Impact on the character of the area.
- (iii) Loss of light & privacy.
- (iv) Materials and poor weathering of wood.
- (v) Impact on architectural merit of terrace.
- (vi) no respect to the context in which it is set.
- (vii) In-appropriate shape.
- (viii) Bulky addition.
- (ix) unwelcome precedent.

7.0 CONSULTATIONS RESPONSES:

Sustainability - Conservation Team: Proposal should be described as a lounge and not a conservatory, along with two other points (the siting of a circular stone planter and the blocking up of a doorway) that do not relate to the extension, The Conservation Officer does not object to the planning application.

8.0 PLANNING POLICIES:

- <u>Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review) 2006</u> - seeks to ensure that development proposals resolve detailed planning considerations, including amenity.

- <u>Policy BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review) 2006</u> - All alterations and extensions should respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building

- <u>Planning Policy Statement 1</u> - Delivering Sustainable Development (PPS1) sets out the Government's overarching planning policies on the delivery of sustainable development through the planning system.

- <u>SPG: Neighbourhoods for Living:</u> A guide for residential design in Leeds (2003) <u>Planning Policy Statement 5</u>: Planning and the Historic Environment - in reference to Conservation Area and Listed Building Control - Alterations and Extensions. The policy states that in judging the effects of any alteration or extension, it is essential to have assessed the elements that make up the special interest in the building. It is the quality and interest of areas rather than that of individual buildings that should be the prime consideration regards development within Conservation Area.

UDP: Building Conservation: Conservation Areas -

Policy BC7 refers to the required use of traditional local materials.

Policies N18-22 seek to preserve and enhance areas designated as Conservation Areas, in order to ensure that not only does no detriment result from any form of built development but also that such development should seek to improve and enhance its setting wherever possible.

Policy N19 is specific to new buildings and extensions within or adjacent to Conservation Areas preserving or enhancing the areas character by the siting and scale of a proposal being in harmony with adjoining buildings, relating proportionately to them, using appropriately sympathetic materials and giving careful attention to the design and quality of boundary and landscape treatments.

Headingley Conservation Area Appriasal

9.0 MAIN ISSUES

- Impact on Conservation Area
- Accuracy of measurements
- Overshadowing
- Materials
- Impact on neighbours
- Representations

10.0 APPRAISAL

10.1 Impact on Conservation Area and design and Character

The materials of the extensions are not considered to be acceptable, as apart from the slate tiling of the roof they fail to match the original dwelling. The rear extension is of a generally sympathetic scale and simple enough form to respect the character of the surrounding area, but the element that juts out from the building line jars with the simple form of the house and reads as a discordant feature. The extension is situated to the rear of the house and away from predominant public views within the street scene although one side wall can be viewed over a tall brick wall adjacent to the site and as a result the visual impact on the locality will be minimal. However, the Cedar cladding of its walls is out of keeping with the prevailing character of the host and terrace row. The proposal is therefore considered to be unduly detrimental to the character and appearance of the original dwelling, terrace row, rear street scene and Conservation Area.

10.2 Overshadowing /overlooking

The rear extension is of a significant projection from the rear of the original house. The adjacent building 55 Cliff Road, is a nursing home located to the south of the extension and set more than 1metre lower down in level. The adjoining building 53 Cliff Road is north-west of the extension. The tracking of the sun which indicates the likely impact by resulting shade shows that neither of these properties has suffered any loss of light from the erection of the extension.

Two large and clear glazed patio doors dominate the rear elevation of the extension and look-out onto the extensive rear garden area. The side elevation adjacent to 55 Cliff Road is completely devoid of any windows. The other side elevation has 3 full length horizontal windows. The nearest of these windows measures 6M away from the closest adjacent window of 53 Cliff Road, with that furthest away measuring 9M. Combined with an acute angle between the windows of approximately 8 degrees, it is considered that the windows of the extension does not inflict any significant impact upon the adjacent buildings by loss of privacy. However, they do overlook the garden of number 55 due to the lack of boundary treatment between all the houses at the rear. It is considered that there would be no increased overlooking as these gardens are already significantly overlooked by a number of dwellings.

10.3 Materials

The natural blue slate tiles covering the lean-to roof of the extension are a good match to those of the host dwelling and other houses of the row. The horizontal Cedar boards that clad the elevations are not in keeping with the external appearances of the host dwelling, those of the other dwellings to the row or within the wider street scene of Cliff Road. Whilst scope exists to accommodate contemporary design and materials within Conservation Areas should not be at the expense of the requirement to enhance or preserve their character and as such the appearance of the extension is considered to be detrimental.

10.4 Representations

As mentioned previously three letters of representation were received, all in objection to the proposal.

The details of the submitted plans are correct. The inaccuracies of the details that were submitted relate to the extension initially being assessed as Permitted Development The extension was then subsequently built without grant of permission. The extension needs permission due to its level of projection and use of Cedar cladding to the exterior within a Conservation Area.

In response to the other comments, all of the relevant issues have been covered within the appraisal above and as a result will not be discussed further. Other comments made are deemed to information with regards to the history of the property, PD calculations and existing drainage and as such are issues not considered relevant to the material planning considerations.

11.0 CONCLUSION

11.1 For the reasons outlined in the above report and taking into account all other material considerations it is considered that the extension is does not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Background Papers:

Application File 09/03653/FU