
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2017

by Michael Moffoot DipTP MRTPI DipMgt MCMI

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

Decision date: 6th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/16/3165651

23 Adel Park Gardens, Adel, Leeds LS16 8BN

- 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 Stewart Sharp against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref: 16/04477/FU, dated 12 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is timber cladding to existing front and sides of existing front gable wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the decision notice includes reference to various extensions to the appeal property. Whilst these works do not appear to be a matter of dispute between the parties and I understand are the subject of a previous permission¹, they do not form part of the proposal as applied for. I shall therefore confine my considerations to the proposed timber cladding to the existing front gable.
3. The appellant claims that planning permission may not be required for the timber cladding. This is not an issue before me however, and the opportunity exists for him to pursue the matter through procedures set out in sections 191 and 192 of the Act.

Application for Costs

4. An application for costs was made by Mr Stewart Sharp against Leeds City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises a detached two-storey dwelling externally finished in white painted render under a steeply pitched tiled roof. The site lies at the

¹ Council ref: 16/02212/FU

- eastern end of Adel Park Gardens; a cul-de-sac of large detached dwellings set on generous plots enhanced by mature landscaping.
7. Amongst other things, Policy HDG1 of the Supplementary Planning Document: *Householder Design Guide* requires all alterations to respect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the locality, with particular reference to architectural features and materials.
 8. A few dwellings on the street are externally faced in stone with brick flank walls. However, the majority of properties are finished in white render which, together with projecting front gables, steep roof pitches and architectural detailing, imparts a distinct character redolent of the 'Arts and Crafts' movement. Although many properties have been altered and extended, the defining characteristic of the street remains the consistency of the architecture. Whilst it may include an aluminium faced canopy and removal of some existing stone features, the approved scheme for alterations and extensions to the appeal property would not dilute this character.
 9. Within this context the proposed timber cladding to the appeal property would be a prominent and discordant addition which would be wholly out of keeping with the host building and the street scene of which it forms part. In coming to this view, I am mindful that the dormer cheeks to some dwellings in the street are clad in timber or uPVC, but they are modest structures and do not compromise the street's prevailing architectural homogeneity.
 10. I have also taken into account alterations to other properties referred to by the appellant. Those in Adel Park Gardens are generally low key and in keeping with the host building and street scene. Other examples in the wider area are either of unfortunate appearance and not good examples to follow, or are materially different in nature to the appeal proposal.
 11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would conflict with those parts of Policy P10 of the *Leeds Core Strategy* (2014) and saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the *Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006)* which require high quality inclusive design that respects and enhances existing streets and buildings, resolves detailed planning considerations and respects detailing and materials of the original building.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, and notwithstanding the absence of local objections, I conclude that the proposal is unacceptable and the appeal should fail.

Michael Moffoot

Inspector