



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 March 2022

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/22/3291104

10 Farm Hill Crescent, Meanwood, Leeds LS7 2QA

- 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 Jamie Denby against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/08756/FU, dated 22 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2021.
 - The development proposed was originally described as construction of single garage within the existing curtilage of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The garage is in situ. Therefore, I am dealing with the appeal retrospectively.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a bungalow at the end of the street adjacent to a junction of footpaths between Farm Hill Crescent and Farm Hill Rise. The wider housing estate does not have a particular architectural interest and there are elements of the footpaths that are not of a particularly high quality. However, they do provide good connectivity for pedestrians and were used during my inspection.
5. There are some differences in the building lines and angles of the properties along Farm Hill Crescent and Farm Hill Rise, however, properties are generally set back in their plots particularly on the north eastern side of the streets. This results in a distinctly open setting around the footpath junction, making a small but positive contribution to the character and appearance of this part of the estate.
6. The garage is positioned significantly forward of the host property in a prominent position adjacent to the footpaths. In this context, the garage appears as a striking feature in a position that fails to harmonise with the established pattern of development and has significantly eroded the open setting around the junction of footpaths.

7. It is a large garage but remains subservient in scale to the host property and its design is in keeping with the bungalow. However, this does not overcome my concerns in relation to its positioning to the front near the footpaths.
8. I therefore conclude that the development conflicts with the requirements of Policies P10 and P12 of the Council's Core Strategy (2019), Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan (2006), the guidance within the Leeds Householder Design Guide (2012) and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These say, amongst other things that new development for buildings and spaces, and alterations to existing, should be based on a thorough contextual analysis and provide good design that is appropriate to its location, scale and function.
9. The garage may improve the security at the host property. However, I have not been presented with any evidence of a particular crime issue here. Moreover, the garage reduces the extent of passive surveillance to the footpath and in this regard, it is not a security benefit overall.
10. The garage improves the facilities at the appeal property. However, personal circumstances will seldom outweigh more general planning concerns, and this does not, therefore, outweigh my concerns on the main issues.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the development conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations that outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR