



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2024 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3349645

10 Bletchley Road, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 4FG

- 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 Sean Anderson against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03026/FU.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 8 (No.8) Bletchley Road with specific regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal scheme would result in a long wall against the shared boundary with No.8 Bletchley Road owing to the extent of the proposed development's projection from the rear of the appeal property. This, coupled with its height and blank, featureless appearance would dominate views from the rear windows of No.8. The proposed extension would result in a strong sense of enclosure when coupled with the existing effect from No.8's garage to the rear on the opposing boundary. This cumulative visual dominance would unacceptably reduce the quality of outlook from both the neighbour's windows and the garden space to the immediate rear of No.8 to the detriment of the living conditions of its users.
5. There is a close boarded timber fence separating the gardens of the appeal building and No.8 but it would be much lower than the eaves and total height of the extension and thus would not sufficiently mitigate its adverse effects as I have explained them. The occupiers of No.8 have not objected to the appeal scheme, but this would not obviate the need for an assessment as to its effects in the context of the main issue.
6. The proposed development would therefore be unacceptably harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of No.8 Bletchley Road with particular regard

to outlook. As such it would fail to comply with Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan 2006 which requires development to consider the effect upon the surrounding environment and amenities of occupiers of nearby properties amongst other things.

Other Matters

7. Regarding the approved applications in the Horsforth area referenced by the appellant, I have not been passed any further details or made aware of their specific circumstances. I cannot therefore be sure there are sufficient similarities with these extensions, or that their respective contexts are the same as the scheme before me such that it would alter my conclusions on the main issue.
8. The appellant also refers to a fallback position of erecting a 3-metre-deep single storey rear extension under the allowances of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). Specifically, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A. There is no evidence before me that such a position has been formally established for the appeal site, or an alternative scheme setting out how this might be achieved. This would be a matter for determination through the submission of an appropriate application to consider whether such a scheme would be permitted development, and not a determination as part of this appeal. In any event, such a proposal would be for a shorter extension than the appeal scheme.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. The proposals would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal is dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR