



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2022

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3291926

7 Lyndhurst Close, Scholes, Leeds LS15 4AQ

- 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 Thomas Vickers against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/06851/FU, dated 6 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension; conversion of flat roof to pitched roof to rear; raising of roof height with dormer windows to front; insertion of rooflights to front and rear; erection of boundary wall and gate to front/side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension; conversion of flat roof to pitched roof to rear; raising of roof height with dormer windows to front; insertion of rooflights to front and rear; erection of boundary wall and gate to front/side at 7 Lyndhurst Close, Scholes, Leeds LS15 4AQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/06851/FU, dated 6 August 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: LC-PA-01; LC-PA-02; LC-PA-03; LC-PA-04; LC-PA-05; LC-PA-06; LC-PA-07.

Preliminary Matters

2. For the sake of brevity and clarity, I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice.
3. The Council have stated that the single storey rear extension and rooflights are appropriate in scale, size and location, and they accord with the relevant development plan policies. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dormer windows, roof height raising and front boundary treatment on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The area surrounding the appeal site is characterised predominantly by residential properties of mixed design and form. The area comprises of a mix of two storey and bungalow buildings with variant architectural stylings and

materials including dormer windows, front extensions, use of brick and render to external walls, as well as different boundary treatments such as walls, fencing and hedgerows. It is this mixed built form and detailing that contributes positively to the character of the area.

6. The proposed dormer windows would be sensitively designed ensuring that they, and the windows within them, would not be overly large or cramped and not appear as incongruous features that dominate the appeal property or the surrounding area. The appeal property is in a prominent location and the increase in the ridge height of the roof would appear marginal which would not detract from the appearance of the area.
7. Due to the mix of different materials in the area, the rendering of the property including parts of the dormer windows, would not be at odds with the street scene. Similarly with the proposed boundary treatment, given the varied styles of front enclosures, the boundary treatment would not be a stark contrast and its scale would be sympathetic to its surroundings, not appearing as an overbearing feature.
8. Accordingly, the proposed dormer windows, roof height raising and front boundary treatment would not be discordant forms of development and would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would be in accordance with Policies P10 and P12 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy, Policies GP5, BD6 and N25 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review, Policies LE1 and BE1 of the Barwick in Elmet & Scholes Neighbourhood Plan, Leeds Householder Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks extensions or alterations that harm the character and appearance of the main dwelling or the locality to be resisted.
9. I have had regards to the Council's Officer report including comments regarding the existing dormer window at 12 Lyndhurst Close. This matter however does not alter my findings above.

Conditions

10. Conditions relating to timeliness and the identification of plans are necessary in the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty. The Council had requested a condition relating to materials however, materials are detailed on the approved plans and therefore such a condition is not necessary.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would not conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding.
12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR