
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2021

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3263640

106 Brackenwood Drive, Gledhow, Leeds LS8 1PZ

- 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 Richard Whitehead against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref: 20/06080/FU, dated 22 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first floor sun room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house with a single storey side element. Externally, it is constructed of red brick and a tiled roof. It has a typical arrangement of domestic windows, in particular on the front elevation. There are French doors on the side elevation at first floor level. The roof contains solar panels.
4. The property is located close to the corner of Brackenwood Drive with Lincombe Rise. It is also near opposite the junction with Chandos Gardens. Brackenwood Drive also rises up to the site from beyond the Lincombe Rise junction. Accordingly, the appeal property is prominent in the streetscene. This includes the side elevation, as it is set forward from its neighbour on Lincombe Rise, even with the planting alongside part of the common boundary. The area in the vicinity of the site is residential in nature, containing semi-detached houses, short terraces and occasional blocks of flats that are set out in a planned layout.
5. The proposal would have a glazed design that would project out from the side elevation of the appeal property at first floor level. It would be untypical for such a glazed structure because it would have an elevated siting. The design would be in contrast with the ratio of windows to the built form on the property. Hence, it would not result in a uniform and balanced appearance. It would be an incongruous addition that would fail to compliment the design and the appearance of the property.

6. Such a raised glazed structure would also be an uncharacteristic feature in these surroundings, even where there is a degree of variety in external materials. It would be clearly visible from the streetscene and the prominence of the site would further increase that the proposal would appear conspicuous and not in keeping. With the level of visibility that would be afforded, it would not respect the site or the area.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to other glazed structures, as well as those which differ in design from their respective host properties. The rear dormer on 4 Lincombe Rise, which is close to the appeal site, is a different type of extension and it is substantially set back from the streetscene. Glazing alterations to the flats that I have been referred to relate to a type of residential development that is wholly different. The other examples are found too distant from the appeal property and are separated by other buildings and open spaces to appreciably impact its character and appearance. Glazed first floor structures in the form proposed are not a feature of the local character on such properties.
8. Clearly, a first floor side extension is likely to be visible from the streetscene in most instances. However, this is why it is important that the design of such a development is in keeping with its surroundings. This would not be achieved by the proposal for the reasons that I have set out. I do not find any particular harm arising from the proposed roof on the basis that the colour finish would be as per the host property. Nevertheless, this does not address the harm that would arise from the projecting glazed elevated design of the proposal.
9. I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the building and the area. As such, it would not comply with Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council, Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) which expects development to provide a good design that is appropriate to its location, scale and function, and to respect and enhance streets, spaces and buildings according to the particular local distinctiveness and wider setting of the place, amongst other considerations.
10. The proposal would also not comply with Policy HDG1 of the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) where it states that all alterations and extensions should respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality. It also draws particular attention to window detail and materials, amidst other design facets. It would also not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) where it concerns achieving well designed places.

Other Matters

11. The proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties, in relation to light, dominance or privacy, subject to the proposed obscured glazing. However, this does not overcome the harm to the character and appearance. Nor does that it would not conflict with the Framework in other respects.
12. The appellant considers that it is not in the public interest to decline the proposal. The effect on the character and appearance of the building and the area is, though, of legitimate public interest. This is ably demonstrated by both

the development plan and the national planning policies that I have referred to above, as well as the SPD. Hence, character and appearance is a matter for my deliberation.

13. The appellant has also referred to how the Council has dealt with various planning applications on the appeal site and cites an inconsistent approach with other developments elsewhere. Matters in relation to the consultation on the planning application have also been raised. As my decision relates solely to the planning merits of the proposal, these are not for my consideration.

Conclusion

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

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR