



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2021 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MIEMA
CEnv MRTPI

Decision by Zoe Raygen DipURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/ N4720/D/21/3279136

1 The Gills, Otley LS21 2AQ

- 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 Waqar Altaf against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01683/FU, dated 24 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is part 2 storey side, part single storey rear and part 2 storey side with annexe over garage extensions.
-

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 upon the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No. 1 is a detached two-storey dwelling with asymmetrical roof, located on a corner plot at the junction between The Gills and Newell Carr Road as well as The Whartons. The property incorporates a dormer on the roof slope of the side elevation.
5. The surrounding area is residential, and the street scene on The Gills and The Whartons in which context the appeal property can be viewed is characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached, single and two-storey terraced dwellings. Some of these, as identified by the appellant are of very different appearance and design. However, the scale and massing of the built form shows some uniformity, and the appeal property reflects the general size and form of properties in the area. The dwelling's location at the junction makes it fairly prominent and visible within the wider streetscene.
6. The proposal would result in a property with two gable ends either side of a central forward-facing gable. The design of the extensions while being of similar materials, would subsume the original host dwelling and substantially increase its mass and

volume. As a result, by virtue of its considerable increase in scale, and the lack of subservience of the extensions, the proposed development would appear overly dominant and disproportionate to the host property and its surroundings, particularly given its prominent location. The harm would be further exacerbated by the steel staircase, an uncharacteristic and obtrusive feature, on the side elevation which would project further than the original front wall of the host property.

7. While there are generous separation distances to surrounding properties and differences in land levels, the proposed extensions would still be read in the context of the surrounding built form and would not, for the reasons above, integrate with or relate well to it.
8. The appellant refers to an extant approval for part two storey, part single storey side and single storey rear extensions¹ and contend that the additional elements in the Appeal proposal do not have such an impact over and above the scheme already approved. However, even a marginal increase in size and additional elements can have significant impact on the character and appearance of a scheme as is the case with the appeal proposal. In addition, the extensions proposed within the extant approval would be entirely subservient to the host dwelling. That would not be the case here.
9. The Council has expressed that the building which would result from the proposal would be too big for the plot. However, it is my view that, given the relatively large plot in comparison to those surrounding it, there would still be ample space in this corner plot to accommodate the proposal and garden space. However, even though acceptable in this regard, for the reasons above, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policy P10 of Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy (as amended 2019) and saved policies GP5 and BD6 of Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) and the National Planning Policy Framework which seek amongst other things to ensure that size, scale, design and layout of a new development is appropriate to its context and respects the character and quality of surrounding buildings as well as the size and form respecting the original building.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR.

¹ 18/00394/FU