



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2022

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3297627

71 Willans Avenue, Rothwell, Leeds LS26 0NF

- 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 Christopher Head of C H Home Improvements against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/07764/FU, dated 17 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is to change a pitched roof to a flat roof (1st floor).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The change to the roof has been completed and therefore I am considering this appeal retrospectively.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Whilst there is some variation to the design of properties on Willans Avenue, with a small number of flat roof elements, the predominant character comprises two-storey semi-detached, hipped roof dwellings of a similar design and proportions to that of the appeal property. This leads to a pleasing consistency to the street scene.
5. The development is lower than the main ridge height and would use matching materials. Nonetheless, the flat roof jars with the style of the main hipped roof and diminishes the character of the host building. This incongruous feature is at a high level, drawing the eye from neighbouring properties where it would be seen in glimpses from the street, unacceptably detracting from their appearance. Moreover, it would be obvious from nearby gardens and properties. The replication of the style of roof of the single storey rear extension, which is not visible from the street and is partly screened by the first floor element in some views, does not lessen this harm. In addition, while the previous cat-slide roof may not have been typical, its sloping nature more closely replicated the main roof.
6. There are examples of flat roof extensions visible from the street that have been drawn to my attention. I am not aware of the particular circumstances in

those cases but note that such flat roof extensions are in a minority and are sited on a different spur of the cul-de-sac so do not contribute to the appeal sites immediate setting as they are not seen within the same views. In any event such examples do not demonstrate that this is an appropriate form of development or justify further harm.

7. The appellant's desire to create fully useable accommodation on both floors and at the same floor level is understandable, as is the desire to create better balance to the rear windows. I have, however, been given no evidence that suggests that this can only be achieved with a flat roof. Indeed, I saw that extensions have been built on similar properties that have pitched and hipped roofs which do not appear bulky or overly dominant, thereby remaining subservient to the main dwelling.
8. I therefore conclude that the development unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The development therefore does not accord with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy, and saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review which seek to achieve development that respects its context and is of a high quality design. In addition, it is contrary to the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework which aim to achieve well-designed places.

Conclusion

9. The development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no other considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
10. I hereby dismiss this appeal.

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR