



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 May 2024

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/Z/23/3321472

Shop at 17 -19 Woodview Street, Beeston, Leeds LS11 6JY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms S Bano against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 22/07707/FU.
 - The development proposed is proposed addition of glazed window to Woodview Road elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. 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 original application.
3. The Council states that its reason for refusal includes a typo and that saved Policy BD6 should be saved Policy BD7 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) (the UDP). It also states it should have referred to the Leeds City Council Design Aid Shop Front Security Design Guide (the SFSDG). These were both referred to within the Council's officer report. The appellant has had the opportunity to provide final comments. Therefore, I do not consider anyone's interests would be prejudiced if I deal with the appeal on the basis that saved Policy BD7 of the UDP is the correct policy.
4. I was unable to see the glazed windows during my site visit, as they were obscured by the roller shutters. Therefore whilst the development is termed as retrospective, my decision is based upon the plans before me. I am satisfied that the plans provide sufficient detail to assess the development in its entirety.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the host building and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. Occupying a prominent corner location on Woodview Road and Woodview Street, the appeal property has significant exposure and is highly visible in the

area. There is an established business at the site which has a shop front and door facing Woodview Street, both with external metal roller shutters. The appeal proposal comprises bi-fold doors, fascia sign and a roller shutter at ground floor facing Woodview Road. Although there are commercial businesses and places of worship in the locality, the area is characterised by parallel streets of red brick residential terraces. The terraces have a consistent regular pattern and external appearance which contribute to the local character of the area.

7. The proposed glazing consists of opening bi-fold doors that expand across most of the width of the appeal building on the narrow elevation facing Woodview Road. The amount of glazing and its width would create a void and a weak corner of the building when read together with the door and shop frontage facing Woodview Street. The substantial host building, which has a wide and steeply pitched gable with windows at second floor level would be seen in context with the development, and the effect on the building would be that it appears top heavy and unbalanced. The bi-fold doors would create a distinctly modern and incongruous element fronting Woodview Road at odds with the regular appearance and arrangement of existing nearby shopfronts and traditional windows in residential properties.
8. At the time of my visit, the roller shutters were down and completely solid in appearance. The full extent of both roller shutters and large fascia on two sides of the host building extending to the ground would be in stark contrast to the smaller roller shutter on the adjacent unit. Individually and when seen with the existing roller shutter and fascia on the host building the development has an imposing and dominating appearance creating a blank and unwelcoming appearance which adversely affects the streetscene.
9. I conclude the development overall results in harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the area. The appellant has not advanced any exceptional circumstances for the roller shutter or other material considerations to justify the development, required by the SFSDG.
10. The development would therefore be contrary Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) and saved Policies GP5 and BD7 of the UDP which together require shop fronts to relate to the host building, with a resolved design that is appropriate to its context. The proposal would also conflict with chapter 12 of the Framework where it requires good design. For similar reasons there would be conflict with the guidance in the SFSDG.

Conclusion

11. There are no other material considerations to suggest that the decision in this case should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR