



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2019

by John Dowsett MA DipURP DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/19/3236378
48 Carr Road, Calverley, Pudsey LS28 5RH

- 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 Stuart Trees against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/03446/FU, dated 4 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion to existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Calverley Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The planning application form described the appeal proposal as a loft conversion to the existing dwelling. The drawings submitted with the application showed that this was to be achieved by the construction of a flat roofed dormer window on the rear roof slope of the appeal building.
4. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that in making decisions on planning applications and appeals within a Conservation Area, special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the area. In addition, Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
5. The appeal building is a two storey, terraced, house, built in stone with a roof finished in large stone tiles. It forms part of a short terrace of five similar properties with a sixth, double fronted, house located at the end. In the immediate vicinity of the appeal site there are a mix of terraced, semi-detached and detached buildings, predominantly stone built and two storeys in height. There is some modern backland development behind the buildings fronting Carr Road, which is of a different character but is, nonetheless, still within the conservation area boundary. To the south side of Carr Road are stone built, two and three storey, terraces running perpendicular to Carr Road,

terminating at the north end with gables fronting the main road. Whilst there are variations in design, the widespread use of local stone and stone roof tiles, and the similar ages of many of the buildings, give the area a homogeneity and distinct character.

6. The appeal building is identified in the Calverley Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAA) as being within a group that makes a positive contribution to the conservation area. The CAA sets out that this part of the conservation area encompasses the late 19th Century extension to the village associated with the growing significance of the woollen industry.
7. Although the proposed rear dormer would be set below the ridgeline of the house, away from the line of the eaves and away from the edges of the roof, as suggested by the Leeds Householder Design Guide 2012 (the HDG) it is, nevertheless, a large structure that would extend across more than half of the rear roof plane. The submitted drawings show that the flat roof of the dormer would be located just under the level of the ridge tiles, and within a very short distance of the eaves line. The appeal building has a relatively narrow frontage and a fairly shallow roof pitch, which would make the proposed dormer appear disproportionately large in comparison to the host building.
8. At the rear of the terrace of which the appeal building forms part, there are no other dormers present. Whilst there is an irregular roofline, this is largely due to the houses in the terrace having different depths of plan. There are various single and two storey additions to the rear of the houses forming the terrace, nevertheless, above the eaves level, the roof slopes are not interrupted by built features and play an important part in the appearance of the terrace. Within this context the proposed, large, flat roofed dormer would appear as an incongruous feature.
9. The dormer would not be visible from the main road, however, the land to the rear is also within the conservation area and the rear elevations of the properties in the terrace play a part in its character and appearance. There are dwellings to the rear and there would be views of the dormer from these and the access drives leading to them. The dormer's presence would, therefore, not be unnoticed.
10. My attention has been drawn to other dormer windows within the wider area and I was able to see these during my site visit. Whilst I accept that these are present and some are more visually prominent than the appeal proposal, I do not have the full details of these developments or the circumstances that lead to them being constructed. In any event, each planning application and appeal must be determined on its own merits. This notwithstanding, these dormer windows are few in number and dispersed throughout the conservation area. Large box dormer windows are not a characteristic of the area, where the roof forms are generally simpler and roof planes uninterrupted. From what I saw, I do not consider that these existing dormers represent a type of development that should be encouraged within the conservation area or that they create a precedent for the appeal proposal.
11. Due to its flat roofed form and overall size, the proposed dormer would detract from the appearance of the historic roofscape at the rear of a terrace of buildings which are identified as making a positive contribution to the conservation area. The management plan in the CAA seeks the retention of stone or slate roofs. Whilst it may be possible to construct the outer faces of

the proposed dormer in materials that match the existing roof covering, the original form of the roof and much of the original materials would be lost. Taken together with the appearance of the proposed dormer, this would be harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Due to the relatively small scale of the proposal and extent of the conservation area, this harm would be less than substantial.

12. Paragraph 196 of the Framework requires that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, in this case the Calverley Conservation Area, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The appeal proposal would provide additional living space for the appellant and change a two bedroom house to a three bedroom property. However, I have no evidence in respect of the housing stock in the area or the need for three bedroom properties within the settlement. The benefits of the proposal would be largely private rather than public and, consequently, would not overcome the great weight that the Framework requires to be given to the conservation of heritage assets.
13. I therefore find that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the Calverley Conservation Area. It would be contrary to the relevant requirements of Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds Core Strategy; Policies GP5, BD6 and N19 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) and Policy HDG1 of the Leeds Householder Design Guide 2012 which, when read together, expect new development to provide a good design that is appropriate to its location and which protects, and enhances, historic assets and locally important buildings; respects the scale and detailing of the original building; and preserves or enhances the character and appearance of conservation areas.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Dowsett

INSPECTOR