
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2016

by Anne Jordan BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 6 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/16/3157286
7/8 Oaksfield, Methley, Leeds, LS26 9AE

- 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 Mike Vary against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00468/FU, dated 8 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of a domestic outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant revised the proposal during the course of the application. For the avoidance of doubt I have determined the appeal on the basis of revised plans which were before the Council at the time of the decision namely:
16NP048/22/001 Rev B, 16NP048/22/003 Rev C, 16NP048/22/004 Rev C,
16NP048/22/005 Rev B.

Main Issue

3. The main issue for the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Oaksfield is served by a single track road which separates the rear of properties from long gardens. The other side of the properties open out to gardens immediately adjoined by open countryside. As a result, although the access serves the "rear" of the properties, for practical purposes these are used as the properties' main entrances. The road therefore has a semi-public character and the garages and other outbuildings which sit within the gardens are in prominent view. These are generally small in size, although I noted a small number which occupied more than the width of a single garden and so were relatively large, being similar in size to small dwellings. These larger buildings appeared as incongruous features in the streetscene when viewed alongside the smaller domestic outbuildings.
 5. The appeal relates to the erection of a large outbuilding within the gardens of Nos 7 and 8 Oakfield. At the time of my visit the site appeared to be being used for the storage of disused motor vehicles and was secured to the front by high wooden panelling. In views of the site from adjoining land the vehicles,
-

containers and other detritus which littered the site appeared out of place in the otherwise domestic setting of the adjoining plots.

6. The proposed building would appear substantially larger than the smaller outbuildings which make up the wider streetscene. Its height and depth, together with the relatively high eaves and large roller shutter door would give it the appearance of a substantial commercial building. Taking into account the residential character of the lane, due to its incongruous size and functional appearance it would fail to assimilate comfortably into the wider domestic setting, and so would be harmful to the character of the area.
7. I take into account that permitted development rights can enable relatively large structures to be erected within residential gardens and I note the scenario put forward by the appellant, comprising 2 large buildings. However, I have no compelling evidence that such works would be undertaken as a probable alternative to the proposal before me, and this limits the weight I attribute to the matter as a fallback.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would fail to provide development which is appropriate to its location and respects the character of the wider locality. Of the policies put forward by the Council I consider policy P10 of the *Leeds Local Development Framework, Core Strategy* to be most relevant and find that the proposal would conflict with its aim of protecting the visual amenity of the area. It would also conflict with guidance within the *National Planning Policy Framework* which seeks to resist development which fails to take the opportunity to improve the character and quality of an area, and the way it functions.
9. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters before me, I dismiss the appeal.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR