



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2021 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/21/3271253

46 Pickard Court, Whitkirk, Leeds LS15 9AY

- 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 Clark Linstrum against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/07335/FU, dated 8 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as raised ridge & loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. The description of development is taken from the application form, whereas both the decision notice and appeal form refer to the dormer as being to the front. I have determined the appeal accordingly however I will address this matter below.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling of similar character and form to the surrounding properties. The ridgeline of the host terrace steps down every two properties and this design is reflected on surrounding terraces. Despite the step, the angle of the roof pitch of all properties are consistent and the roofs are largely unaltered, thus contributing to a regular rhythm in the street scene.
6. This proposal would increase the ridge height of the host dwelling, resulting in a steeper roof pitch which would substantially alter the form and appearance of the dwelling. It would therefore appear at odds with the consistent roof pitch and stepped roof line of the wider terrace and those in the locality, thus reading as an intrusive and alien feature.

7. The proposed dormer would span much of the full width of the dwelling, with a lack of a distinct set in from the edge or set down from the proposed increased ridgeline. Due to its substantial size, it would have a bulky and top-heavy appearance that would dominate the host dwelling and fail to read as a discrete addition.
8. Irrespective of whether the dormer would be sited on the front or rear of the property, it would nevertheless be highly visible from the public realm due to its siting adjacent to a vehicular parking area and opposite a public footway. For the reasons noted above, it would appear as an incongruous addition that would fail to respect the consistent form and design of the properties in the locality.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. It would therefore conflict with Policy P10 of the Core Strategy, Leeds Local Plan (November 2014), saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) and HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document (April 2012) which collectively seek to ensure that extensions and alterations are appropriate to their context and respect the character, appearance, scale, form and design of the main dwelling and the locality.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

H Ellison

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, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR