



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2021

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3259424

98 Horsforde View, Bramley, Leeds LS13 1GE

- 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 Miss Sian Bradley against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04105/FU, dated 9 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2020.
 - The development proposed was described as removal of internal wall between kitchen and garage, new wall inserted behind garage door this is to extend the living area. All external walls remain the same.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on car parking provision; and
 - Character and appearance.

Reasons

Parking

3. Although the appellant states that the garage is not large enough to park a vehicle in, no evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the existing garage does not meet the Council's definition of a suitably dimensioned garage parking space¹. The proposal would therefore result in the loss of a parking space where only a further single parking space exists on the property's driveway.
4. The existing driveway is a single-width, single car-length driveway. To the side, there is a small grassed area through which a paved path leads to the property's front door. The front garden area is enclosed by a low stone wall, a means of enclosure typical of the terraced block that the appeal property lies within and also typical of other properties located at the head of the cul-de-sac beyond Hardwick Court. It may be possible to park a second vehicle in the area currently laid to grass, as demonstrated by the appellant in their photo submissions, but to do so on a regular basis would be inconvenient. Moreover, it would be impossible to do so with a second vehicle parked on the driveway without the removal of the stone boundary wall.

¹ p.34 'Householder Design Guide' Supplementary Planning Document – '...garage must measure at least 3.0m by 6.0m.'

5. It is likely therefore that the proposal would result in the displacement of a parking space from within the appeal property to the carriageway which, in turn, would increase pressure for on-street parking spaces. The layout of the turning head at the end of the cul-de-sac and the layout of properties around it, particularly those of the short terraced block that the appeal property lies within, are such that on-street parking directly outside individual properties is limited. There is more scope for on-street parking a short distance to the north of the appeal property, but given the combination of short driveways and narrow plots elsewhere on the main route through the estate, demand for on-street parking appeared generally high at the time of my visit to the site.
6. The loss of an off-street car parking space at the appeal property would result in its displacement to an on-street location, in turn leading to increased parking pressure towards the head of the cul-de-sac, the nature and layout of which is not conducive to on-street parking. It has not been adequately demonstrated that suitable alternative provision could be secured within the appeal site plot and so the proposal would not make adequate provision for, and would fail to address, car parking provision in a positive manner contrary to Leeds Core Strategy (CS) policy T2 and would not achieve the high quality design sought by CS policy P10 or saved policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (UDPR).

Character and appearance

7. There is a pleasing consistency offered by the low stone front garden walls that are a recurring and characteristic feature of a number of properties located towards the head of the Horsforde View cul-de-sac. The appellant has demonstrated that the grassed area at the front of the property, enclosed to the side and front by the low stone wall and bound to the other side by the existing driveway, could accommodate a second vehicle in addition to one parked on the driveway.
8. However, without the removal of the front portion of the stone wall it would not be possible to access this area should a vehicle already be parked on the driveway. The removal of the wall would remove a characteristic feature of this part of the development and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property, the terraced block that it lies within and to the properties situated around the cul-de-sac's turning head. The proposal would therefore fail to secure the high-quality design sought by CS policy P10 and UDPR policies BD6 and GP5.

Other Matters

9. I note that the appellant's household is a currently single-car household but given that No. 98 is a 3-bedroomed property it cannot be assumed that that would always be the case. I give this matter limited weight as a consequence.
10. I have also noted the appellant's statement that a property opposite the appeal site received planning approval for, presumably although it is not stated as such, a proposal resulting in similar alterations to parking provision. I have not been provided with any details of that scheme, which property it relates to or the context and layout of that particular property prior to permission being granted. I have, in any event, considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and I give this matter limited weight.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR