



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2020

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3250354

1 Woodhall Close, Stanningley, Pudsey LS28 7TX

- 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 Zac Iseli against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/07133/FU, dated 14 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is Raise existing roof and convert loft including dormer window.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a modest extended detached bungalow and the first house at the entrance into Woodhall Close. It is located in a street scene of similarly designed bungalows of a detached or semi-detached variety. There are both bungalows and houses located on Woodhall Croft where the estate road of Woodhall Close branches from.
4. Whilst the character of the area is mixed in regard to dwelling types, the bungalows within Woodhall Close all share the same characteristics whether they are detached or semi-detached. From the street scene, there is little evidence of these bungalows having been altered to the front, and they maintain significant symmetry.
5. A strong characteristic of the estate is the hipped roof design of the bungalows. The Close falls towards the hammerhead at the bottom of the estate and therefore the ridge heights of the bungalows along the Close will inevitably have a slight difference in height as they follow the land levels. This is a feature of the estate.
6. Its replacement with the proposed pitched roof would jar with the original character of the host dwelling and would appear as an incongruous feature in this location. The combination of the proposed rear dormer would also add to the overall bulk and massing of the roof. The proposal would be visible within

the street scene from both Woodhall Close and Woodhall Croft and would not respect the advice contained within the Council's Householder Design Guide 2012 for alterations to respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling, with particular regard to roof form and roof line.

7. The adjacent dwelling of No. 8 Woodhall Croft is an 'A' shaped two-storey house and is closely associated with the houses along Woodhall Close with many of a similar design to one another. The proposal is not the same house type and is located on a different street and furthermore, the two properties do not share the same characteristics, therefore the roof heights cannot be compared.
8. The fenestration detail is a component of the dormer window, and regardless of their size, it is the combination of proposed alterations that I conclude would not harmonise with the host dwelling, but would instead lead to harm arising to the character of the host property as well as the street scene.
9. Therefore, the proposal would not comply with the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006 Policy GP5 for development to resolve detailed planning considerations, including design, amongst other criteria, and Policy BD6 for development to respect the original building. It would also be in conflict with Policy P10 of the Core Strategy Leeds Local Development Framework 2014 in its design aims, as well as the HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide 2012. Finally, the proposal would run counter to the National Planning Policy Framework to achieve well-designed places.

Other Matters

10. There may be the opportunity for the appellant to pursue permitted development rights of the property. However, this is not a matter for me to determine in the context of an appeal made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
11. Although the appellant explains that there is a slight discrepancy in the Council officer's Delegated Report in respect of the ridge height of the appeal property, nevertheless, this does not lead me to a different view.
12. Despite no letters of representation being received to the proposal, this does not alter the conclusion I have reached.
13. Any complaints associated with the service received from the Council should, in the first place, be directed to the Council and is not for me to comment upon.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR