



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2018

by Euan FS Pearson BA(Hons) BTP FRGS MRICS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th February 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/18/3213297
66 Bradford Road, Guiseley LS20 8NH

- 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 & Mrs Booth against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 18/02535/FU, dated 19 April 2018, was refused by notice dated 2 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is first floor front extension, single and two storey rear extension with new dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and the Tranmere Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow on the eastern edge of the Conservation Area. Set back from Bradford Road behind a low wall and hedging, the property has previously been extended adding both a conservatory and lengthy, flat roofed dormer to the rear elevation. Bradford Road at the appeal location is a busy thoroughfare and this section is wide with grass verge and mature trees. In my mind it offers important views of the Conservation Area. There are various styles of housing, and examples of properties that have small, subservient front dormers.
4. The proposal would add extensions to the front and rear of the appeal property, including two front dormers, to create additional upstairs bedrooms and other living space on the ground floor. The resulting property would have four gables with different ridge heights. The proposed front dormers are not diminutive and will dominate the front roof scape. The rear extension will have flat roofed side dormers. These are awkward and of poor design. Cumulatively, this proposal will fundamentally alter the scale, design, character and appearance of the appeal property.

5. There is a limit to the number and scale of extensions that can be added to a property before resulting in overdevelopment. I consider that the proposal will overwhelm the appeal property causing appreciable harm to its appearance.
6. The defining characteristic of the Conservation Area is that of the dominance of greenspace: houses within a landscape. The proposed extensions are overly large and harm the overall aesthetics of the heritage asset. The resultant house will not sit comfortably in its reduced sized garden, altering the view of the streetscene. However, I find the harm would be less than substantial, as set out in paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
7. Therefore, the proposal conflicts with policies GP5, N19 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006), and policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds Core Strategy. Among other things, these policies require proposals to respect and enhance the character and appearance of the townscape (including conservation areas), landscape and buildings, through high quality design.
8. Similarly, I also conclude the proposal does not comply with either the relevant design principles of the Leeds Householder Design Guide supplementary planning document, or the actions in the Tranmere Park Estate Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Plan. Creating high quality buildings and places is a planning fundamental in the NPPF.
9. The statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is of considerable weight and importance. Having regard to the above, I conclude the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. This weighs significantly against the proposal in accordance with the NPPF which states at paragraph 193 that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation irrespective of the degree of harm.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has submitted various photographs of properties with dormers. It is not in dispute that there are examples on Bradford Road or other parts of the Conservation Area. I have taken this into account. The presence of larger, front dormers is not, however, widespread and does not change my conclusions on the specific harm I have identified arising from the appeal proposal.
11. The appellant draws my attention to a non-specific example of development of a bungalow on Hawksworth Lane. However, without appropriate details, such as drawings, I cannot consider that any further.

Conclusion

12. The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of both the appeal property and the Conservation Area. The harm to the significance of the heritage asset, whilst less than substantial, would not be outweighed by the benefits. Accordingly, I conclude the appeal be dismissed.

Euan FS Pearson

INSPECTOR