
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 April 2017

by Matthew Birkinshaw BA(Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 11th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/17/3168061

153 and 155 Richardshaw Lane, Stanningley, Pudsey, LS28 6AA

- 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 Charanjeet Kaur and Arshad Mahmood against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/05839/FU, dated 17 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is side dormers to both 153 & 155 Richardshaw Lane.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal relates to nos.153 and 155 Richardshaw Lane. I have therefore referred to the site address as shown on the Council's decision notice, as this more accurately describes the location.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host properties and the streetscene within Richardshaw Lane.

Reasons

4. Nos. 153 and 155 Richardshaw Lane are situated on the end of a traditional 2-storey row of terraced properties. As part of their refurbishment 4 flat-top dormers are proposed at second floor level to create additional living space.
 5. Along this part of Richardshaw Lane the streetscene is varied. It includes a mix of traditional terraced properties and larger, industrial buildings opposite the appeal site. The neighbouring commercial properties also include dormer windows at second floor level.
 6. However, unlike their neighbours the appeal properties share a hipped roof with the ridge running perpendicular to the street. In order to facilitate the proposal a large gable-end would therefore be required fronting onto Richardshaw Lane. The dormers would also be substantial, modern, box-shaped additions situated only roughly 1m apart. When combined, the size and unsympathetic appearance of the roof alterations would result in a dominating and visually intrusive form of development that would detract from the traditional character and appearance of the host properties.
-

7. Furthermore, no other properties on the same terrace have dormer windows. From the south-east the scheme would therefore be viewed in the context of an otherwise unaltered roofscape. It would also be highly visible within the public domain due to the location of the appeal site adjacent to Richardshaw Lane. As a consequence, the visual impact of the alterations would be significant, and the gable-end with 4 modern, flat-topped dormers would represent an incongruous and discordant feature in the streetscene. Although the proposal would create additional, functional living space, its size, scale and appearance would represent a poor standard of design that would be harmfully out of place in this location.
8. In reaching this view it is appreciated that the hipped roof would have to be altered in order to maximise the dormer windows. But this does not justify allowing such a large, incongruous form of development in a highly prominent location. No evidence has been provided to suggest that additional living accommodation could not be created without introducing such a large and visually intrusive extension to the roof.
9. I therefore conclude that due to the size, design and prominence of the dormer windows, combined with the alterations required to the pitch of the roof the proposal would fail to respect the character and appearance of the host properties and would detract from the streetscene within Richardshaw Lane. As a result, it conflicts with *Leeds Core Strategy* Policy P10 which, amongst other things, supports proposals provided that the size, scale and layout of development is appropriate to its location and respects the character and quality of the locality. For the same reasons the proposal is also contrary to *Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review* (LUDPR) Policy BD6 which requires all alterations and extensions to respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building. Of the policies referred to by the Council these are the most relevant.

Other Matters

10. In refusing planning permission the Council also states that the size and prominence of the dormers would 'adversely affect neighbouring amenity'. However, the dormers would be set-back from the eaves and down from the ridge of the terrace. They would also face towards the highway and/or the side of adjacent commercial properties. As a result, there would be no harm to the outlook or living conditions of neighbouring residents. In this regard there is no conflict with Core Strategy Policy P10, LUDPR Policy GP5 or Policy HDG2 of the *Leeds Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* insofar as they relate to the protection of residential amenity.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents. However, it would detract from the character and appearance of the host properties and the streetscene within Richardshaw Lane. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Matthew Birkinshaw

INSPECTOR