



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 September 2022

by P Storey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3303308

14 Beck Lane, Collingham, Wetherby LS22 5BW

- 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 L Tate against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01812/FU, dated 10 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2022.
 - The development was originally described on the application form as "Raising of roof, rear dormers".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for raising of roof height, inset balcony to roof and roof lights to rear at 14 Beck Lane, Collingham, Wetherby LS22 5BW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/01812/FU, dated 10 March 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location plan 001

Proposed block plan; existing and proposed front elevation 002

Proposed plans and elevations 010
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the application form does not reflect the development proposed by the plans. Accordingly, I have relied on the description from the Local Planning Authority's decision notice and also from the appellant's appeal form which is more accurate and concise.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - i. The character and appearance of the area, specifically with regard to the inset balcony; and
 - ii. The living conditions of prospective occupiers, with regard to outlook and provision of headroom.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site lies within a predominantly residential area. It is located close to, but outside of the boundary of the Collingham Conservation Area (the 'CA'). The appeal dwelling, along with the adjacent dwellings of Nos 12 and 16 Beck Lane, back on to the watercourse of Collingham Beck. From here and the adjoining footpath, which is within the CA, the rear roof slopes of the appeal property and those of its neighbours are partly visible through gaps in the dense tree cover and vegetation within the rear gardens.
5. The rear roof slopes of the appeal dwelling and those directly adjacent are not uniformly designed and this varied roofscape forms an intrinsic part of the character of the area. The inset balcony would introduce a feature not currently found in the immediate area, though it would not extend beyond the plane of the rear roof slope and its visual effects would therefore be limited to the appearance of the opening within the roof slope and the associated fenestration. The opening would be comparably larger than most other window openings to the rear of the dwelling, but it would be recessed into the roof slope and would not add to the scale or massing of the roofscape, thereby maintaining an acceptable degree of subservience. The doors would align vertically with the corresponding doors to the ground floor. They would be partly screened when viewed from ground level by the lower part of the roof slope, thereby reducing their visual prominence and maintaining subservience.
6. The natural screening from the footpath and between dwellings would limit views of the wider streetscape. The effect is that the variation in roofscape would not be immediately apparent, particularly given that dwellings are appreciated more individually than as a collective. I acknowledge my visit took place with trees in near full leaf, and also that some of the trees and vegetation may be lost over time. Nevertheless, based on the situation at the time of my visit the mature vegetation would be likely to continue to provide a degree of screening throughout the winter months. This would provide visual separation between dwellings as well as from views across Collingham Beck.
7. In taking the above matters into account, I find the proposed development would be an appropriate alteration to the dwelling that would maintain an acceptable level of subservience. Its form, scale and detailing would respect the character and appearance of the area, and furthermore it would not be harmful to the setting of the Conservation Area. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with Policies P10, P11 and P12 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), Policy D of the Collingham Neighbourhood Plan, Saved Policies GP5, BD6 and N19 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006), and Policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide SPD. Together, these policies and

guidance seek to provide good design that is appropriate to its location, scale and function and reflects local character; conserves and enhances the historic environment; and ensures that extensions respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of existing buildings.

Living Conditions

8. The proposed development would provide an additional floor of living accommodation within the extended roof space. The only change to the ground floor layout would be the removal of the smallest bedroom to create a staircase to access the upper floor.
9. The roof space would provide 2 bedrooms, a WC/shower room, a sitting area and the aforementioned inset balcony. The larger bedroom would also include an en-suite and provide access to an office. Whilst the headroom would be limited in places, the proposed development would provide accommodation across the full width of the dwelling's ridge line. As such, even if some areas were to have restricted headroom, occupiers would be free to arrange furniture to suit their needs and would benefit from an overall increase in the amount of usable living accommodation. I have been provided with no policy basis to support the use of the measurements given by the Local Planning Authority and can therefore give this matter only limited weight.
10. On the issue of outlook, roof lights are proposed along the rear roof slope. The use of roof lights in living areas is not unusual, and by their nature they provide less opportunity for horizontal outlook than standard upright windows. However, they would still provide an element of outlook, particularly from a seated position, which is compatible with the use of the space to provide living and bedroom areas. Furthermore, the proposals would not harm outlook from the existing living accommodation, which would be largely unaffected by the proposals.
11. In taking the above matters into account, I find the proposed development would provide an acceptable standard of living conditions to prospective occupiers with regard to provision of headroom and outlook, and would be in accordance with Policy P10 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) Saved Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006), and the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework, which together seek to protect and provide a high standard of visual, residential and general amenity for existing and future users through high quality design.

Conclusion and Conditions

12. Taking all matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions relating to the statutory time limit, a list of approved plans for the purposes of clarification, and a requirement for external materials to match the existing building in the interests of good design and protecting the character and appearance of the area.

P Storey

INSPECTOR