
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2021

by S Hunt BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/21/3282123

41 Spencer Place, Chapeltown, Leeds LS7 4DQ

- 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 A. Akram against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/08325/FU, dated 11 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension to existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description as set out in the banner heading above refers to a first floor extension only, however the Council's officer report and appellant's statement also refer to the retention of a security shutter on the existing building, and this is shown on the submitted plans. I saw the security shutter was in place on my site visit and I am therefore considering this element of the proposed development on a retrospective basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The existing garage is situated to the end of the rear garden of no. 41 Spencer Place which is a three storey end of terrace dwelling. Spencer Place is an attractive wide tree-lined avenue containing a range of similar large terraced houses. The appeal site backs onto Gathorne Street where the character changes to a more dense street layout of smaller two storey terraced houses. The site is prominent from a number of viewpoints given its location on the corner of three streets.
5. I noted a number of garages and outbuildings to the rear of the terraces backing onto Gathorne Street, largely beyond Gipton Avenue, some of which appear to have a second storey within the roof space. However, there are very few detached structures to the rear of the terrace in which the appeal site is located, and there are none to its immediate neighbours.
6. From the elevation facing the host property, the existing garage building retains a traditional appearance with architectural detailing. It has a mono-

pitch slate roof with an interesting pyramidal feature to the centre, timber dentil blocks to the gutters and a small lean-to projection, all of which break up its massing.

7. From the Gathorne Street elevation, the building has been substantially altered in the past. It has modern features including a poorly fitted upvc window and a solid grey steel roller security shutter which fills almost the entire width of the building. The roller shutter was closed when I viewed the site, however the submitted plans indicate a door and window behind it, together with a large opening. By virtue of its scale, design, and use of inappropriate materials, the security shutter significantly jars with the character of the existing building, the host property and the street scene. It gives the building a commercial appearance, detracting from the residential character of the area.
8. The proposed first floor extension would have limited effects when viewed directly from the Gathorne Street elevation. However, when one moves further along the street, its visual impact would be significant. The roof would have a very slight almost unnoticeable incline so it would appear as flat. This is a roof type which is not a characteristic feature of the area. From the side the entire building would appear as a large, discordant boxy structure unrelated to the host building and its surroundings. The harm to the Gipton Avenue elevation would be particularly significant, with a mass of brick wall directly adjacent to the footpath dominating the street scene. The aforementioned architectural features at the rear of the building would be completely lost, resulting in harm to the setting and character and appearance of the host property.
9. The proposed extension to the building and the retention of the security shutter would both result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area. The proposals fail to comply with Policy P6 of the Leeds Core Strategy (selective review 2019) and saved policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) which seek good design appropriate to its context and which respects the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building.
10. The proposed development also conflicts with Policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide supplementary planning document which requires extensions and alterations to respect the character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality. Furthermore, I find conflict with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 127 in terms of the lack of sympathy with local character, and paragraph 130 in relation to the poor design which fails to take into account local design standards.

Conclusion

11. The appeal is dismissed.

Susan Hunt
Inspector