
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2020 by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3262493

51 Braemar Drive, Garforth, Leeds LS25 2NJ

- 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 Mrs Jane Sadler against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02974/FU, dated 23 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling located on a corner plot at the junction of Braemar Drive and Invargarry Close. The property fronts the latter and has an existing single-storey extension to the side. This would be removed to facilitate a two-storey side extension.
5. The Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) advises when considering extending on a corner plot, the extension will be visible from two streets and care should be taken to ensure that the design is suitable in relation to both streets. There is also the need to take account of the building line of the side street.
6. Houses on Braemar Drive feature generous setbacks from the road. Given the location on a corner plot, the appeal property differs from most other houses in the vicinity given its side elevation faces this road. Nevertheless, there is currently the same generous spacing to this side which maintains the open character and contributes positively to the wider street scene. Moreover, Braemar Drive has a set building line which the appeal property maintains with its side elevation, despite the existing extension.

7. The proposal would add significant mass to the side of the dwelling, eroding the space at this prominent corner plot and would read as an overly dominant addition to the street scene. Moreover, the extension would break the established building line and appear out of character with the wider street scene. Whilst the existing side extension protrudes beyond this, it is only single storey, of modest scale, and partially obscured by the boundary hedge. It does not redefine the building line as a result. The lack of impact upon neighbouring living conditions does not alter the assessment of character and appearance, which is the basis for refusal.
8. My attention has been drawn to other developments in the area which the appellant considers similar to the proposal. I have limited information on these, but they appear a considerable distance from the appeal site. They would therefore have different circumstances which led to their approval. Moreover, the pattern of development appears different in those street scenes when compared to the vicinity of the appeal site with regards to less prominent building lines and varying distances from the road. As such I would not consider these comparable to the proposal before me and their approval does not alter my assessment of the appeal proposal.
9. To conclude, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the streetscene. This would be contrary to policy HDG1 of the SPD and policies P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy and GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan. Collectively these seek to ensure, among other aims, the size, scale, design and layout of development is appropriate to its context and respects the character and quality of surrounding buildings and the streets and spaces that make up the public realm. The proposal would also be contrary to the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, which encourages development which is sympathetic to local character.

Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR