



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2020

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3251836

1 Deanswood Rise, Moortown, Leeds LS17 5JH

- 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 Ms Lauren Hook against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref: 20/00881/FU, dated 10 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed garage on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a recently renovated semi-detached house that has been extended most noticeably by way of a 2 storey side extension. The site frontage is enclosed apart from where access is taken into the site. It displays a splayed side boundary which extends towards the corner of Deanswood Rise and Deanswood View, and where the proposed garage would be located. This boundary contains a wall and fence arrangement, with planting on the side of the neighbouring property.
4. Levels rise up Deanswood Rise towards the site and it is also markedly set at a lower level than Deanswood View, to the north. The arrangement of semi-detached properties are largely uniform, as are the associated building lines. This gives the distinct impression of a planned layout.
5. The proposed garage would be set well forward of the host dwelling and the building lines along the adjacent roads. Hence, it would not adhere to the spatial character of the area, including the contribution of the host dwelling. As it would abut the corner of Deanswood Rise and Deanswood View, it would also appear as a cramped form of development. This would not be satisfactorily addressed by the remaining land to the front of the host dwelling still being open in order to accommodate the access arrangements.
6. In this locality, the proposed garage would be an outbuilding of some size and scale. The projected height would be modest due to the effect of the levels and boundary enclosure but this would not adequately overcome the harm, in

- particular by virtue of its forward siting in a corner location. The use of a sedum roof and the potential to utilise a hedgerow as the boundary treatment to reduce its prominence would only likely draw attention to that its positioning would not conform to the local character.
7. The proposed garage would be uncomfortably apparent as approached from Deanswood Rise to the west because it would be sited well in front of the houses. Even though it would be set down from Deanswood View to the north, the alignment of this road draws attention to the appeal site and the presence of the proposed garage would be foremost with its siting on the corner. In these terms, it would not be a discrete addition to the streetscene.
 8. The Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) warns against garages which project forward of the main front wall of a dwelling. This is a case, with regard to the SPD, where a corner plot would not ably accommodate such a proposed garage without it resulting in undue harm.
 9. Where houses in the area have been altered and extended, they have done so in a way that has maintained the prevailing character, which the proposal would not achieve for the reasons that I have set out. The property with a detached garage on King Lane that I have been referred to lies too distant from the site to appreciably inform its character and it does not share the same planned layout as where the appeal site is found. A lack of unacceptable harm as regards living conditions and in other respects does not address the character and appearance concerns.
 10. I conclude that the proposed garage would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. Therefore, it would not comply with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), and with 'Saved' Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) (UDPR) which, collectively, expect development to provide a good design that is appropriate to its location, scale and function; resolve design as a detailed planning consideration; and respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building, amongst other considerations.
 11. It would also not comply with Policy HDG1 of the SPD as it would not respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality. It would not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework where it concerns achieving well designed places, including that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.
 12. The UDPR policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because of their age. They are consistent with the Framework as far as character and appearance matters and so they attract significant weight in my decision.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all matters that have been raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR