
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2017

by S Jones MA DipLP

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

Decision date: 11 December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/17/3181348
Limewood Approach, Leeds LS14 1NG

- 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 Prospect Estates Ltd against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/01530/FU, dated 8 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 2 May 2017.
 - The development is cladding to building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for cladding to building at Limewood Approach, Leeds LS14 1NG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/01530/FU, dated 8 March 2017, and the plans submitted with it ref: Site Location plan and Drawing 07- elevations.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is part of an industrial estate located off the Leeds outer ring road. The building was originally white rendered brick with 1930s style windows with small square panels and glazing bars. This has been covered over by dark grey horizontal cladding, which is already in place.
4. The cladding is part of the corporate identity of the gym but it must still have a satisfactory appearance overall. With regard to Policy BD6, I agree that the alterations do not reflect the features of the original building because the windows are covered over and the materials and colour do not match. However, in the circumstances of this particular case, I note that effectively the original building lies behind the cladding, so that there is no visible mismatch apparent. Moreover, although there are no windows still visible, the appeal site represents a relatively small proportion of the surrounding commercial and industrial development in the area. Consequently the effect of its blank walls on the streetscene is limited, so that this particular development does not adversely impact the overall impression of active frontages or commercial activities.
5. The development is situated a reasonable distance from the ring road- about 35m. Views of the cladding are limited due to that distance and the fact that

traffic on the ring road generally passes at speed. Traffic visiting the site remains largely commercial or industrial. Taking more general views of the site into account, there are a number of different styles and designs to the industrial and commercial buildings in the vicinity, which has a mixed commercial character. The dark grey box cladding reflects those industrial and commercial characteristics, and consequently I conclude that the development is not inappropriate in that context or significantly harmful to the existing building or the area.

6. Although I have identified conflict with Policy BD6, as set out above I conclude that there is no significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal site or the surrounding area arising from the development. I conclude there is accordingly no conflict with Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review and Policy P10 of the Leeds Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document which together aim to secure appropriate design that reflects its surroundings.

Conclusion

7. The Council did not suggest any Conditions were required, and in view of the fact that the development is already in place, I do not find any Conditions are necessary. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S Jones

INSPECTOR