



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2020 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3248881

8 Holly Avenue, Cookridge, Leeds, Yorkshire, LS16 6PN

- 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 Emad Al-Rikaby against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/07134/FU, dated 16 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as an extension to 8 Holly Avenue, Leeds LS16 6PN.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. As set out above, the application form describes the proposal as 'an extension'. The Council's decision notice expands on this and advises that the proposal is for alterations to roof including raising the height and dormer windows to the front and rear to create rooms in the roofspace; single storey front, side and rear extensions with terrace area; demolition of detached garage and erection of new detached store to the rear. From all I have seen and read, the proposal also includes a two storey side extension.
4. During my site visit no one was present at the appeal property to grant me access the rear of the property, and therefore I am unable to assess the effect of those elements of the proposal at the rear.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the locality.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The street consists of bungalows along one side, including the appeal property, and two-storey properties along the opposite side. The rooflines of the properties follow the slope of the street, with the ridge lines stepping down between adjacent properties. One of the bungalows, at the top of the street,
-

has a front dormer to provide accommodation in the roofspace. The remaining bungalows do not have front dormers and form a group that generally have a cohesive appearance and rhythm which makes a significant contribution to the character of the street.

7. The proposal would see the appeal property significantly enlarged and the roof of the bungalow extended upwards. Whilst the eaves level would be unchanged, the ridge would be considerably higher. As such the resulting building, including the proposed front and rear dormers, which are overly large and bulky structures, would not reflect the form and massing of the host dwelling or its neighbours. Moreover, the resultant ridge line would not respect the slope of the street and the step-down in ridge heights between adjacent properties. Consequently, the proposal would be discordant with the street scene and would detract from its character and appearance.
8. I note that the property at the top of the street, No 2A, has a larger roof than the other bungalows and has a front dormer. However, this property is on the end of the group of bungalows and is at a higher level than the other bungalows, and therefore the ridge respects the step-down in ridge heights. While this property has a front dormer, the front dormer proposed in the appeal scheme would take up more of the roof slope and its position in the middle of the group of bungalows would exacerbate the prominence of the proposed roof alterations.
9. For these reasons the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the locality. As such the proposal would conflict with Policies P10 and P12 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (2014), Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006), and principle HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide (2012). These policies and principles all seek, in various ways, for the size, scale, design and materials of a development to be appropriate to its context and to respect the character and quality of the host property, the surrounding buildings and the street, and to protect the character of the townscape and landscape.

Conclusion

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

D Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR