



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2023

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3316497

199 Wakefield Road, Drighlington, Leeds, Bradford BD11 1EB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andrew Mountain against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03033/FU, dated 27 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is Removal of existing timber and slate roof conservatory and replacement with dwarf wall, glass roof white UPVC conservatory to the front
 - (south facing) side of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Removal of existing timber and slate roof conservatory and replacement with dwarf wall, glass roof white UPVC conservatory to the front (south facing) side of the property at 199 Wakefield Road, Drighlington, Leeds, Bradford BD11 1EB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/03033/FU, dated 27 April 2022, and the Location Plan; Proposed Elevations and Plan Drawing No. 199-01-Rev1.

Procedural Matter

2. The proposed development has already been complete as identified on the decision notice. The appeal before me has therefore been assessed on a retrospective basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site accommodates a detached dwelling located along a row of other similar residential properties that are set back from the street with garden areas and parking to the front. A mid-height red brick wall runs across the front of the property and its neighbours along with a number of trees and shrubs enclosing the front garden areas.
5. Although the front garden areas of surrounding properties are generally free from any built form, the host property already benefitted from a timber conservatory extension to the front and the proposed development has merely replaced this conservatory with a more modern conservatory comprising UPVC.

6. Whilst the replacement conservatory is slightly larger in footprint and height. It remains single storey of a relatively low height with an overall design similar and complimentary to that of the main property. This, together with the limited depth and width remains subordinate to the main property.
7. I acknowledge the Council's concern regarding the overall appearance and scale of the former conservatory which is said to have been more lightweight and inconspicuous and that such conservatories are typically found to the rear of properties. I have also noted the Council's suggested changes. I appreciate that the replacement conservatory is constructed from predominantly white UPVC glazing to the sides and roof, alongside a brick dwarf wall. However, the replacement conservatory is located within the same location albeit slightly greater in footprint and height and the use of UPVC is reflective of materials used within the main property and on the properties nearby including the Old Brickworks Brewers Fayre located opposite the site. Consequently, the conservatory does not look bulky and prominent compared to the size of the main building even taking into account important architectural features such as the original bay window and does not appear discordant given the diverse use of UPVC nearby.
8. Additionally, the landscaping that exists to the front of the property and along the row of other properties helps to screen the conservatory from certain views particularly on approaching the site along Wakefield Road. Filtered views of the conservatory is only really apparent from short range views to the south. As such, any visual impact arising from the proposed development is limited.
9. I conclude that the proposed development does not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Accordingly, I find the proposed development to accord with Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), Policies BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) and Policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide, 2012 which together amongst other matters, requires all extensions, additions and alterations should respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality. The proposed development also accords with chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to achieving well-designed places.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council taking into account the retrospective nature of the appeal. I have included the approved drawings, in the terms of my decision in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the development plan as a whole, the appeal is allowed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR