



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 July 2022

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3301637

10 The View, Lidgett Park, Leeds LS8 1JL

- 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 Craig Wilson against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/05515/FU, dated 22 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area, including the setting of the conservation area.

Reasons

3. The View is a residential street comprising a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings. The boundary of the Roundhay Conservation Area runs along the front and rear of the appeal site but does not include the house itself. While there is variety within the street as a whole, the appeal site forms part of a row of 5 detached properties. Despite some differences in appearance, the detached properties are in general harmony with each other in terms of their character and appearance and there is manifest uniformity in the roofscape, owing to the consistency in hipped roofs which creates a clear sense of balance. The symmetry of the detached dwellings are a key feature in the street and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. There is another similar property next to 2 The View. However, from my site visit, I did not see any clear views of it from The View. It is not within the same row and so does not form part of the uniform roofline. For these reasons, it is not seen as part of this collection of houses, so the permitted amendments to it do not justify change to the appeal property.
5. The creation of a gable ended roof at the appeal property would be an incongruous addition and a jarring element compared to the existing sloping hipped roof. The proposal would result in the dwelling having an awkward presence, the proposal being prominent in the roofscape, detracting from the consistent roof lines in this section of the street. Moreover, it would unbalance the otherwise harmonious character and appearance of these detached dwellings.

6. While the semi detached dwelling next to the appeal site is taller, the effect of the proposed rise in ridge height and chimney would be experienced when viewed alongside the uniform roofscape of the detached dwellings. I note that the appellant is content to amend the plans to maintain the ridge height. However, even if the ridge height was not raised, the gable roof itself would still be unduly prominent and would be discordant with the existing roofscape. From my site visit I noted that the chimney on the appeal site was lower than the chimneys on the other detached dwellings. While a taller chimney would be more in keeping with the other properties, it would do little to compensate for the detrimental effect of the gable roof on the character and appearance of the area.
7. The Council has raised concerns about the harm to the setting of the Roundhay Conservation Area which surrounds the site. The Conservation Area Appraisal summarises its significance, which includes the residential development on the fringes of the park as a large area of superior late Victorian, Edwardian and inter-war housing in the region, surviving in a relatively unaltered and uninterrupted state. I consider that the appeal property, as part of the uniform row of hipped roof detached dwellings, makes a positive contribution to the setting of the conservation area.
8. The harm that I have identified would be 'less than substantial' harm to the contribution that the setting makes to the significance of the conservation area. The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets, irrespective of the level of harm. While the proposal would provide accommodation for the appellant's growing family, these benefits would be largely private. There are no public benefits before me sufficient to weigh against the permanent harm that would arise to the significance of the conservation area.
9. For the reasons given, the development causes harm to the character and appearance of the area, including the setting of the conservation area. This is in conflict with Policy P10, P11 and P12 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy selective Review 2019) and saved Policies GP5, BD6 and N19 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (Review 2006). Amongst other things, these policies seek new development that contributes to place making and is of a size, scale and form that is appropriate to its context. The character and appearance of conservation areas should also be preserved or enhanced by ensuring the siting and scale of the buildings is in harmony with the adjoining buildings and the detailed design, including the roofscape, is such, that the proportions of the parts relate to each other and to adjoining buildings.

Other Matters

10. I understand that other properties in the area have been granted planning permission for rear dormers and gable ends including 26 The Avenue and 8 The View. However, it has not been shown that the permission granted at 8 The View is directly relevant, and there are no clear views of 26 The Avenue from The View. I also note the appellant's comments about the Council's handling of the application. This has little to do with the planning merits of the case, which I have considered on the basis of the evidence before me and a recent site visit.

Conclusion

11. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that have been shown to have sufficient weight to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR