



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2022

by Diane Cragg Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/22/3293061

25 Alandale Road, Garforth, Leeds LS25 1DN

- 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 B White against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/07752/FU, dated 2 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is residential development of 1no. new dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on (i) the character and appearance of the area, and (ii) highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Alandale Road includes a mix of two and single storey dwellings, mostly set back from the road behind front gardens and driveways. Properties have similar building lines and mostly have large rear gardens. In the adjacent streets of Barley Hill Road, Summerhill Road and Kingsway there is a variety of house types, but generally dwellings face a road frontage and follow a comparable building line.
4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dormer bungalow with driveway to a detached garage behind the house. The property has a large garden, considerably bigger than its neighbours, which is a mainly grassed area bordered by fencing, mature hedging and trees.
5. The side and rear gardens of properties facing Alandale Road and the rear gardens of properties facing Summerhill Road and Kingsway adjoin the appeal site. I agree with the appellant that there is less uniformity in plot sizes with corner plots and smaller gardens evident adjacent to the appeal site compared to further along Alandale Road. Even so, the rear gardens are largely free of buildings and provide a spacious backdrop to the built development along the street frontages. The mature and attractive appearance of the rear gardens contributes to the area's character and appearance.
6. The appellant refers to the site having very little public visibility. However, I saw at my site visit that the topography of Alandale Road is such that there are clear views of the appeal site from all surrounding properties and from the

entrance to Alandale Road from Kingsway, as well as between the properties along the Kingsway frontage.

7. The proposed dwelling would have a large footprint occupying a significant part of the rear garden. Although limited to single storey, the overall height of the proposed dwelling would be noticeably higher than most of the surrounding boundary treatment. It would notably intrude into the open attractive rear garden land and introduce significant built development and areas of hard surfacing. The dwelling's location would be at odds with the established neighbouring frontage development. It would jar in its local context and appear as a prominent and incongruous feature which would detract from the open, spacious, and mature gardens.
8. Whilst No 89 Barley Hill Road is an established part of the wider area, it is not sufficiently close to the appeal site to influence the character, grain or pattern of development on it. Further, the large side garden area of the adjacent property to No 89, as well as the width of No 89's driveway and the size of the front garden, gives No 89 a presence along the street frontage, whereas the appeal proposal would sit behind 25 Alandale Road and would appear wholly out of character with the frontage development that surrounds it.
9. Although the appellant refers to an appeal decision in Barnsley¹ I do not have sufficient evidence about its surroundings to draw clear parallels between it and the appeal proposal. Nevertheless, the decision refers to the entrance to the site being separated from adjacent properties by soft landscape strips and variety in the surrounding street scene. On the face of it, in these respects, the Barnsley site would be different to the appeal proposal.
10. Overall, I conclude that the development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policies P10 and P12 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) (Core Strategy) and saved Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) (UDP) where these policies seek to ensure that development is appropriate to its context. It would also conflict with the Neighbourhoods for Living Supplementary Planning Guidance December 2003 where it seeks to ensure that development respects local character.
11. Further, the development would not be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) where it seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting and maintains a strong sense of place.
12. The Council also refers to saved Policy BD6 of the UDP, but I do not consider the development to be alterations or extensions to a building and therefore this policy is not relevant to my considerations here.

Highway safety

13. Both the existing and proposed properties would be served by the current access arrangements from the road. Alandale Road is a residential street with footpaths to either side.
14. The Council is concerned that the restricted width of the side access to the appeal site would create conflict between pedestrian and vehicle movements.

¹ APP/R4408/W/20/3253900

However, despite the driveway to the side of the house being below the 3.3 metres sought by the Council's Street Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), there is no substantive evidence before me that the space for vehicles and pedestrians within the site would lead to highway or pedestrian safety concerns on Alandale Road. Alandale Road is served by adequate footpaths and visibility at the access point of vehicles and pedestrians along it have not been identified as substandard.

15. Therefore, in the terms set out by the Council, I conclude that the development would not be detrimental to highway or pedestrian safety and would accord with Policy T2 of the Core Strategy where it seeks to ensure that development is in accessible locations with safe and secure access for pedestrians. It would also accord with the SPD, a key objective of which is to ensure the provision of safe, convenient, direct, and easy access to everyday facilities on foot and cycle.

Conclusion

16. I am satisfied that the development does not raise highway or pedestrian safety concerns, nevertheless, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan, and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR