



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2022

by Diane Cragg Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3299681

22 Woodlands Grove, Stanningley, Pudsey, Leeds LS28 6QQ

- 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 Shane Womersley against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02053/FU, dated 20 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is describe as 'existing roof to be removed and replaced with new raised roof and side dormer. New eaves height to be raised in line with adjacent neighbours building'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached house on a corner plot at the end of a row of terraced properties. It is designed with gable elevations facing Woodlands Grove and Back Woodlands Grove. The design, corner location and proximity of the dwelling to road frontages results in the appeal property being a distinctive feature of the street.
4. Woodlands Grove is part of a mostly residential area largely consisting of rows of two storey terraced houses set back from the street frontage with use of roof spaces, including dormer windows, to create a second floor of accommodation. Adjacent to the appeal site the detached property facing Bradford Road and the large office building sited close to the Owlcoates Lane frontage provide some variety to the street scene. Nevertheless, the appeal property is sited next to an end terraced house and is largely seen in the context of the residential terraced row.
5. The roof extension would be constructed in matching materials and would marry with the height of the eaves and ridge line of the next-door terraced house. However, due to the design and orientation of the existing roof, the extension to it would have an excessive vertical emphasis and a significant gable elevation facing the street that would not sit comfortably with the scale and form of the existing terraced houses. The extended front and rear gable elevations of the dwelling would be significantly more apparent in the street and the additional storey would result in the dwelling appearing

disproportionately large and particularly conspicuous and incongruous in the street scene.

6. In addition, the proposed dormer window would extend out from the dwellings new ridge height and would be of a considerable width. Due to its form and scale the dormer would dominate the roof of the building and result in a roof profile that is significantly at odds with its surroundings.
7. The proposal would be highly visible in the street scene, and it would accentuate the incongruity of the existing dwelling's design on a prominent corner plot. Consequently, the proposal would look harmfully out of place.
8. There are gable elevations near to the appeal site that are close to the road which present significant elements of blank external wall and are prominent features of the street. However, the symmetry and form of these elevations as flank walls to the terraced rows have a different effect on the street scene and do not provide a useful comparison in assessing the proposed development.
9. There are also examples of dormers in the immediate area, not least on the front and rear of the next-door terraced house. Nevertheless, generally existing dormer windows are of a different scale and form and are mostly not sited on prominent corner plots.
10. I accept that there are elements of the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document April 2012 (SPD) with which the extension and dormer may comply. However, as the design is unique, the general guidelines in the SPD do not alter my view that the proposal would not be sympathetic to its surroundings.
11. Overall, the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the host property and the area and would conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds Local Development Framework Core Strategy November 2014 and saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) where these policies seek to achieve good and appropriate design. It would also conflict with the SPD which seeks to resist development which harms the character and appearance of the area.
12. There would also be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to add to the overall quality of the area and be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

13. The letter of support for the proposal does not provide a basis for doing so, I therefore attach limited weight to it.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR