



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: 11 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3293055

2 Chandos Place, Gledhow, Leeds LS8 1QS

- 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 Mrs Shirralee Taylor against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/09433/FU, dated 18 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension at 2 Chandos Place, Gledhow, Leeds LS8 1QS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/09433/FU, dated 18 November 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Dwg: 1711/01A Rev A Dec 2021.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of the development has not changed. However, the wording from the Council's decision notice has been entered rather than that from the application form. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the Council's decision notice which more accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway and pedestrian safety with particular regard to car parking.

Reasons

4. The host property has a single parking space to its rear which would be lost as a result of the extension. This would bring conflict with the Council's Householder Design Guidance (2012) (HDG) which advises, amongst other things, that in circumstances where fewer than two car parking spaces exist on site, extensions should not reduce available parking provision.

5. Chandos Place or other streets in the vicinity of the site have no parking restrictions in place. Many of the properties in the street have no off-street parking and park on-street. This is a characteristic of terraced houses such as the appeal property, with rear yards used primarily as amenity spaces, rather than for parking.
6. At the time of my morning site visit there was on-street parking occurring along Chandos Place and in the surrounding streets. However, there was also spaces available. Where there were parked vehicles, the carriageway in Chandos Place and nearby streets were sufficiently wide to enable other vehicles, including larger vehicles, to pass. As such, it would be possible for vehicles associated with the appeal site to park on-street without causing an obstruction.
7. My site visit represented a snapshot in time and the level of parking would likely be different in the evenings and weekends. However, there is no substantive evidence before me as to whether there is an existing problem with the capacity of on-street parking.
8. Chandos Place is not a through road, as such the level of traffic and pedestrian movement is likely to be low. Moreover, as a single dwelling the level of parking demand is not likely to be so substantial to result in a significant displacement of vehicles in Chandos Place or surrounding streets. As such, I have no substantive evidence that the proposal would result in an adverse effect on highway or pedestrian safety.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable effect on highway or pedestrian safety with regards to car parking, despite the conflict with the HDG. As such, the proposal would not conflict with the wider aims of Policy T2 of the Council's Core Strategy (2019) when read as a whole. This Policy, amongst other things, seeks safe and secure access for pedestrians and development that does not materially add to problems of safety. Moreover, I find no conflict with paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), which seeks to ensure that development does not have an unacceptable impact on road safety.
10. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary in the interests of precision, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord to those submitted with the application. A condition concerning external materials is required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
11. For the above reasons, the appeal is allowed subject to conditions.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR