



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2024 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3346405

11 New Windsor Drive, Rothwell, LEEDS, LS26 0HU

- 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 Adam Box against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00156/FU.
 - The development proposed is described as a retrospective application for render to all elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for render to all elevations at 11 New Windsor Drive, Leeds, LS26 0HU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00156/FU, and the plans submitted with it and identified as: Location Plan, Drawing No. AMB-0001.

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have taken the description of development in the banner heading above from the application form, omitting wording that is not an act of development. I also observed at the site visit that the rendering to all external walls had already been added, and I am therefore considering this appeal retrospectively.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling set within a residential street of other two storey properties. The dominant external material of the properties within New Windsor Drive is red brick. I did however observe on my site visit that there were examples of white render to some of the properties. There are a variety of different frontages and fenestration present within the street and varied extensions. As a result, there is some clear diversity in terms of the appearance of the properties on New Windsor Drive.
6. It is undoubtedly the case that the render changes the appearance of the appeal property, but I am not automatically persuaded that this equates to a

- harmful impact. The render presents an attractive finish to the property and adds visual interest to the area.
7. When approaching New Windsor Drive via Thorne Grove, the appeal property is largely screened by No.13 Windsor Drive due to the stepped setback format of the street. From Sandy Grove the appeal site is more visible. However, I observed there to be comparatively dense vegetation present in both the garden of the appeal site and at No.9 New Windsor Drive, which mostly screens the appeal site from this direction.
 8. The overall appearance of No.11 New Windsor Drive does represent a contrast to the traditional brickwork materials seen elsewhere on the street, but it neither dominates nor significantly impacts on the overall appearance of the street scene or the area. As previously referenced, there are some other properties where white render is utilised as a material, including the gable wall of No.8 New Windsor Drive, and the detached garage of No.17 New Windsor Drive. Whilst I recognise that it is not the dominant material, as a material it is still characteristic of the area.
 9. The Council states in the officer's report that the render 'unbalances' the appeal property and semi-detached neighbouring property. However, although previously the two properties were both predominantly red brick, they remain as separate visual entities due to the character of other previous alterations and additions. I am not therefore persuaded that the change in primary material of the appeal site to white render results in the contended harm or the claimed incongruity within the street scene.
 10. I am therefore satisfied that the render does not result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area and as such does not conflict with Policy P10 of the Core Strategy (2019) or Policies GP5 and BD6 of the saved Unitary Development Plan Review (2006). These policies seek to ensure that the design of new development is appropriate within its locality.

Other Matters

11. The Council refer in the officer report that the example of rendering at No.8 New Windsor Drive cannot be considered as a precedent for the development, due to it lacking planning permission. However, there is no evidence presented that this development is currently the subject of enforcement action, and therefore it cannot be discounted as forming part of the character of the area. In any event, and for all the reasons set out, the development has not been found to be harmful.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR