



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2023

by M Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3320776

1 Park Crescent, Gildersome, Morley, Leeds LS27 7EA

- 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 Gary Suffield of GS Drawn Plans against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00212/FU, dated 10 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 15 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as “proposed outbuilding”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on a triangular shaped corner plot at the junction of Park Crescent and Parkway within a residential area. The property includes a front driveway and gardens to the side and rear. There are low boundary fences and gates to the site frontage and higher fencing to the rear boundaries. The side garden area is occupied by three small outbuildings. The property faces towards a grassed public open space on Park Crescent. The surrounding area is characterised by linear rows of two storey semi-detached properties which are generally situated on generously sized plots and set back from the road behind low boundary fences or hedges. Together with the nearby open space, this gives the area an open and spacious feel which contributes positively to its character and appearance.
4. The proposed outbuilding would be sited within the side garden area where it would replace one of the existing sheds. The proposal would be seen partly against the backdrop of the appeal property and neighbouring properties to the west, particularly 11 Parkway, which occupy higher ground. However, its position forward of the principal elevation of the dwelling and proximity to the highway, together with its large footprint and height above the boundary fence, means that the proposal would be highly visible within the street scene.
5. Whilst the proposal would be a single storey structure which would be subservient to the host property and would not affect the visual gap between the property and No 11 at first floor level, it would nevertheless result in some loss of openness to this prominent corner plot and fail to reflect the prevailing open and spacious layout of the area.

6. I acknowledge that the proposal would replace an existing shed. However, the Council states that this structure is unauthorised which has not been disputed by the appellant and reduces the weight that can be given to it. In any case, the existing shed is significantly smaller and not as prominent in the street scene as would be the case with the proposal. During my site visit I was unable to identify any similar large outbuildings in such prominent positions forward of dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. The proposal would therefore appear as a dominant and incongruous addition which would detract from the character of the street scene.
7. I am mindful that the appellant has made some revisions to the scheme since the previous application¹, including changing the design of the proposal to incorporate a flat roof and introducing tree planting to the southern site boundary. I also acknowledge that the proposal would be constructed in materials to match the existing dwelling. The proposed tree planting and boundary fence would be likely to partially screen views of the proposal from Parkway, but it would still be highly prominent from Park Crescent. These factors would not sufficiently mitigate the harm that I have identified.
8. Overall, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with saved Policies BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan 2006, Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy 2019, and Policy HDG1 of the Council's SPD², which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that extensions and alterations are of an appropriate scale and design to the existing building and the wider context. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

9. The Council raise no concerns in relation to the effects of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. I have no reason to disagree with this assessment on the basis of the evidence before me and my observations on site, though this is a neutral matter that does not weigh in favour of the proposal. I note that no objections were received from nearby occupiers. However, this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
10. The appellant has sought to locate the proposal in the southern corner of the site because there is insufficient space to the rear of the dwelling, but this does not overcome my concerns as they relate to the size and position of the proposal and its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. The proposal does not accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR

¹ Council ref. 22/03001/FU

² Leeds City Council Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012