
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2021

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/21/3277345

3 Creskeld Crescent, Bramhope, Leeds LS16 9EH

- 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 & Mrs Soulsby against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref: 21/01503/FU, dated 22 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as alteration and extensions to sides and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bramhope Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a detached 2 storey house with a single storey rear extension and an attached side garage. It has a simple gable ended roof, with a similar styled roof form set down and extending over the garage. The property is pleasing in its appearance and contains a distinctive 2 storey front parapet feature that is castellated in its design. The house is located on a spacious plot and has a wide site frontage, with gaps up to the boundaries on each side.
4. The site lies within the Bramhope Conservation Area. This part of the conservation area is characterised by high quality plot built suburban housing that date from the inter-war period. They are large, detached properties that are set on generous plots which contain an individual level of design and detailing. Spacing in between is an important element of the pattern of development. The appeal property ably demonstrates these characteristics and contributes positively to the conservation area.
5. There is also the occasional more modern infill plot, such as the neighbouring property to the site at 3a Creskeld Crescent (No 3a). The character of this part of the conservation area has been maintained, even where other development has taken place.
6. The proposal would result in a significant reduction of the spacing with the neighbouring properties. It would be reduced on the side of the garage by the

increased height formed by the proposed first floor extension. Nearest to No 3a, the change would be more marked as the proposed 2 storey side extension would project noticeably closer to the boundary. The overall effect would be to give the appeal property a considerably more lengthened appearance across its plot width. It would also result in the design of the proposed roof not being coherent because the various eaves and the pitches would be at different levels, as would be the expanses of the roof planes, when viewed from the streetscene. It would appear disjointed.

7. Nor does the house at No 3a provide a particular justification for the proposal. The forward part of its front elevation is set well off the boundary, with the side element set considerably far back, so as to maintain a degree of spacing up to the shared boundary. This would be notably lessened by the proposed 2 storey side extension because it would be well set forward of No 3a's side element and flush to the front of the appeal property. The 2 properties would thus appear considerably closer together. Nor does relying on the spacing on No 3a's plot address the loss that would occur on the appeal site with regard to this important aspect of local character.
8. As the proposed dormer would be sited on the front roof plane of the proposed first floor extension, it would further add to the incoherent nature of the roof design. It would also be prominent as it would face the road and be in clear view from the streetscene. Where I observed dormers in the area on my site visit that were drawn to my attention, they were not part of such an overall complex and incongruous roof design.
9. The castellated form of the front element on the property is an attractive design feature. That the proposed replacement gable is also found on other properties does not account for the loss of this feature and its contribution to the individual design of the appeal property within the conservation area.
10. The appellant has referred to the adherence to the guidelines that are set out in the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012). This document does not provide specific guidance on a proposal within this conservation area, but rather this is contained in the Bramhope Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan and which has been referred to by both main parties. It is not appreciable how this has substantively informed the design of the proposal in order for the appeal property to be maintained as a positive building in the conservation area.
11. Taking account of the above, I do not agree that the design would represent a considered approach or tie the elements of the property together. That the external materials would be in keeping would not overcome the harm to the local character.
12. The proposal seeks to align the internal floor levels, that would also improve access for disabled persons, and also address a leaking flat roof. However, a strong level of protection is afforded to the historic environment through the planning system. These are not matters that outweigh the harm that would arise. The not unacceptable effects on both the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties and highway safety simply attract neutral weight.
13. I conclude that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. As such, it would not comply with

Policies P10 and P11 of the Council's Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) where they concern good design, development that is appropriate to its context and respects the character and quality of surrounding buildings, that development protects and enhances the district's existing historic assets, and that the historic environment will be conserved and enhanced, amongst other considerations.

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