



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3307374

Highfield, Margaret Avenue, Bardsey, Leeds LS17 9AT

- 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 Mrs Hannah Tebbett against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01973/FU, dated 16 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is conversion of existing loft with new roof profile, roof lights and rear dormer window.
-

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 building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises an extended two-storey detached house situated on the western side of Margaret Avenue. It is one of a group of houses of similar appearance that feature hipped main roofs with red clay tiles. The visual unity of this group of houses is a positive feature of the street scene.
4. Policies P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (amended 2019) (the CS), saved Policies BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds City Council Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) (the UDP), and Policy BE1 of the Bardsey cum Rigton Neighbourhood Plan (2017-2032) (the NP) generally seek to ensure that development is of good design which, amongst other things, respects the scale, form, proportions and character of the original building.
5. The Council also refers to its 'Householder Design Guide' Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (the SPD), which advises that all parts of the extension (including its roof) should adequately reflect the proportions of the existing house and mirror its architectural details. Specifically in relation to dormer windows, it advises that these should not be of a size and scale which dominates the existing roof; and should maintain and respect the features and proportions of the existing house.
6. The proposed roof alterations would substantially change the shape and overall size of the roof. The sizeable roof would give the host building a top-heavy appearance and the new gable form would be markedly at odds with the other smaller hipped roofs it would be seen in immediate context with. This would

cause the development to appear as an incongruous and visually disruptive element amongst this group of houses, harming the character and appearance of both the host building and street scene.

7. Although the rear dormer would be set in from the edges of the enlarged roof, it would still be a substantial box-like structure occupying a disproportionately large part of the rear roof slope. Its form, large window/door opening, and white rendered sides would not reflect the proportions, fenestration, and roofing materials of the existing building. Consequently, the dormer would not be a well-designed and sympathetic addition to the building. Its limited visibility from the street would not be a good reason to accept fundamentally poor design and the resultant conflict with relevant local and national planning policies.
8. I therefore conclude that the development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host building and its immediate surroundings, and so, conflicts with the design requirements of Policy P10 of the CS; saved Policies BD6 and GP5 of the UDP; Policy BE1 of the NP; and the SPD. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) with regards to achieving well designed places.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has suggested that much of the development could be constructed using permitted development rights, but no details are provided. In the absence of any firm evidence of how a very similar or more harmful development could realistically take place, I attach negligible weight to this matter in the context of this appeal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, the development fails to accord with the relevant policies of the development plan and the Framework. There are no material considerations in this case which indicate that a decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR