



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 15 November 2021

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/21/3277852

7 Parkway, Gildersome, Morley LS27 7DZ

- 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 Matt Tyler against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00985/FU, dated 4 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is new detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the submission of the appellant's appeal the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published and came into force on 20 July 2021. In light of this I have sought the views of the main parties in writing and comments received have been taken into consideration.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The area surrounding the appeal site is characterised predominantly by residential properties. There is a mix of housing designs and styles with properties in the area having side extensions however, the built form remains mainly of semi-detached properties with gaps between the buildings. It is this consistent built development with spacious open gaps between buildings that positively contributes to the character of the area.
5. The proposed development would be a large structure that would infill an existing gap in the street scene and diminish the open feel in this location. The design, height and fenestration of the proposal would not differ from other properties in the area however, due to the form and scale of the detached property it would be a dominating feature that would erode the spacious environment of the area.
6. The gaps between properties do vary within the surrounding area given the spatial pattern of the built development and various side extensions to some of the properties. I have had regard to the appellants statement of case and reference to extensions at the appeal site and neighbouring properties including at Nos 1, 16, 18 and 20 Parkway. The majority of the side extensions

are subtle additions that do not engulf the space between the properties, whereas the proposal is for a new property that would result in the loss of a significant gap in the street which currently provides a spacious break between the built form.

7. The proposal would be set back from Parkway with driveway and hardstanding to the front that would not be dissimilar to adjacent properties. Nevertheless, the proposal would be an incongruous feature in the street scene that due to its form and size would remove an important spacious gap resulting in an oppressive feel within the surrounding area.
8. Accordingly, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (CS) and the Framework which seeks development to provide good design that is appropriate to its location, scale and function.

Other Matters

9. The proposal would not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of occupiers of adjacent properties and would not compromise highway safety in the area. I have also had regard to the previous application ref: 20/06455 at this site and note that discussions had taken place. These matters however do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
10. In the decision notice, the Council referred to guidance within the SPG Neighbourhoods for Living however this document was not submitted. This does not alter my findings above and the conflict with the CS and the Framework.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding.
12. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR