



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2022 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by R Sabu BA(Hons), MA, BArch, PgDip, RIBA, ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3304064

46 Farrar Lane, Adel, Leeds LS16 7AF

- 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 Amir Madani against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02747/FU, dated 13 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as, 'partial pitched roof lift and loft conversion with pitched roof dormers to create additional first floor bedrooms, to an existing single storey bungalow.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations including; partial pitched roof lift and loft conversion to form first floor extension; dormer windows to front; rooflights to front, sides and rear at 46 Farrar Lane, Adel, Leeds LS16 7AF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/02747/FU, dated 13 April 2022, 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: LS16-2838 001 A, LS16-2838 002 A, LS16-2838 003 A, LS16-2838 004 A.
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. While I note the description of development stated in the application form, I have used the description from the decision notice in the decision above as it more accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a previously extended single storey dwelling, with two gable features in the roof and set back from the highway behind a mature hedge. It lies within an established residential area with a mix of house types and styles such that the surroundings have an attractive appearance.
6. The proposed extensions would result in a dwelling with a similar footprint to that of the existing dwelling. The roof ridge and eaves level would be raised and roof design altered to incorporate dormer windows on the front elevation. Therefore, given the increased height of the building, it would not result in squat proportions. Although the proposal includes a mansard roof, this would not appear prominent from Farrar Lane. In addition, other than the single storey rear extension, which is to be retained, the roof pitches at high level are similar such that the proposal including mansard roof would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the host building or surrounding area in this respect.
7. As I observed during my site visit, there are examples of two storey dwellings and pitched dormers to the front elevation of dwellings in the area. The proposed dormers would replace the existing gables and sit below the ridge of the main roof and would not therefore be conspicuous in the street scene. They would be in a similar position to the gables, above the ground floor windows, giving the property a balanced appearance. Therefore, whilst the proposal would alter the appearance of the host dwelling it would not be out of character with the surrounding area.
8. Consequently, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or wider area and would not therefore conflict with Policy P10 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) which amongst other matters seeks to ensure that development should be appropriate in its context. It would also not conflict with the guidance in the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) which sets out that extensions should respect the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

9. I note the objection from a neighbour with regard to the additional windows and rooflights in the side elevation. On my visit I saw that the properties were separated by a private drive, Farrar Close and that there would be sufficient distance between the properties to limit any additional overlooking.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in accordance with the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. A condition specifying the approved drawings is necessary to provide certainty and a condition relating to materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposal would not conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, which outweigh this finding.

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR