
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2017

by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/17/3174470
43 Church Lane, Methley, Leeds LS26 9HN

- 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 Ben Denison against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/07881/FU, dated 17 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is change of hip to gable roof. Construction of rear dormers to roof space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The plans submitted with the planning application feature a slight discrepancy, whereby part of the gable end of the proposed roof is shown as hipped. The appellant's agent has detailed the correct elevations in their statement. Given that this is a minor correction to the plans to accurately detail the proposal, I have considered them in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling, featuring a hipped roof and two storey side extension. The area is residential in character, being located on a suburban road, with open fields and playing pitches to the rear. Dwellings on the road are similar in design, most being two storey semi-detached, with those surrounding the appeal property having hipped roof designs.
5. The appeal proposal seeks to alter the original roof form from hipped to a gable with the addition of a rear dormer. The proposal would remove the original symmetrical roof design of the pair of semi-detached dwellings. This would unbalance and disrupt the established roof design of dwellings within this street scene. It would not respect the roof form or proportions of the property and would result in a prominent and noticeable change in the roof line of the area. This is particularly relevant in this location as the appeal dwelling is set within a

- row of uniformly designed properties, all of which have retained their hipped roof design.
6. The harm caused by the proposal would be further intensified by the retained hipped roof of the existing two storey side extension, which would have an awkward and inharmonious junction with the host dwelling due to the differing roof forms.
 7. I note the appellant's agent contends that the existing two storey side extension unbalances the pair of dwellings. However, given its set back from the front elevation and reduced ridge height, I consider that it has been sensitively designed to ensure it is a subservient addition, maintaining the original character, form and proportions of the dwelling. The proposed change would therefore adversely affect the character and appearance of the existing building with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 8. The rear dormer's design would have a wide and boxy appearance, occupying much of the original rear roof slope, resulting in an overly dominant and disproportionate addition to the roof. Whilst being sited at the rear, it would be a prominent addition that I consider would be incongruous in this setting and would result in a harmful addition to the host dwelling.
 9. Consequently, the proposal would fail to comply with the general objectives of Policy P10 of the Core Strategy, Leeds Local Development Framework (November 2014) and Saved Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (review – 200), Volume 1: Written Statement (July 2006) to ensure good design. I also find conflict with the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (April 2012) which sets out general principles under 'HDG1', seeking to ensure that all alterations should respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality, with particular attention paid to the roof form and roof line.

Other Matters

10. I have noted that there are other developments in the area, and that both parties have specifically referred to 38 Church Lane and 71 Church Lane. In relation to No 38, I saw that the design of this extension was very much in the minority, when comparing existing extensions in the street. In any event, the extension at No 38 serves to confirm that such a hip to gable roof extension does remove the original symmetrical roof design of the pair of semi-detached dwellings and unbalances the established design and street scene. In relation to No 71, the original hipped roof has been retained, which to some extent, maintains the original symmetry. In reference to all other examples mentioned by the appellant's agent, I do not have the full details before me and in any event, each proposal falls to be considered on its own particular merits and that is what I have done here.
11. I have also noted the amended scheme proposed in the appellant's submission. However, this scheme would be quite different from that subject to the appeal and in the interest of openness, impartiality and fairness, I have not considered it as the Local Planning Authority and neighbouring residents have not had the opportunity to comment.

12. I have taken account of the appellant's requirement for additional space for his family; however, this personal circumstance does not outweigh the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. Having had regard to all other matters raised, and for the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR