



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2022

by P Storey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3304617

2 Otterwood Bank, Wetherby LS22 7XT

- 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 Brooke against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00563/FU, dated 25 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an extended detached house within a residential estate. The neighbouring dwellings are predominantly detached and vary in style. The appeal dwelling has a gable roof with gable ends to the side elevations, and some neighbouring properties feature a rotated design with gable ends to the front and rear. The site lies on a prominent corner of Otterwood Drive and Badger Wood Glade.
4. The proposals would extend further outwards than the existing porch and across a wider portion of the front elevation, encompassing the existing shallow bay window up to the set-back edge of the two-storey side extension. The proposed extension would not project beyond the corresponding building line of the adjacent dwellings, and the facing materials and roof design would largely reflect those of the existing dwelling.
5. However, its scale in terms of width and depth, and its design, including the ground floor window, would not respect the appearance of the host property. The result would be an unduly dominant addition that would adversely affect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. Whilst I note the appellant's comments include reference to an alternative design option featuring a shallow bay window, I have not been provided a copy of any alternative proposals. I have therefore given this matter no weight in my decision.
6. Whilst the hedgerow to the property boundary would reduce the visual impact of the proposal from Badger Wood Glade, it would be visible via the driveway

opening on Otterwood Bank. In any event, the hedgerow could be removed at any time should the appellants or future occupiers choose, so could not be relied on to reduce the visual impact of the proposal indefinitely.

7. As part of my site visit, I viewed the nearby examples cited by the appellant at 10 Badger Wood Glade, 11 Foxwood Walk and 60 Otterwood Bank. However, the design of these dwellings and the individual characteristics of the sites were notably different from the appeal subject. As such, they provided no reasons to alter my previous findings.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposals would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area, which would conflict with the aims of Saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) Volume 1: Written Statement, and Policies P10 and P12 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), which together require developments to provide good design that is appropriate to the location, to ensure alterations and extensions respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building, and require developments to conserve and enhance the distinctiveness of townscapes and landscapes. There is also conflict with the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance, which has similar aims.

Conclusion

9. The proposed development fails to accord with the policies of the Development Plan as a whole and there are no other considerations that outweigh this conflict. For the above reasons, and taking account of all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P Storey

INSPECTOR