



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2022

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3309290
69A Upper Wortley Road, Leeds LS12 4JN

- 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 Arshad Mahmood against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/04436/FU, dated 24 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as house extension and alteration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development above is taken from the planning application form. However, a more accurate and precise description is given on the decision notice and appeal form as 'Alterations including hipped to gable roof extension on both sides to form a first floor level and second floor level; dormer windows to front and rear; hardstanding to front; retaining garden wall to front'. I have determined this appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. This appeal concerns a detached bungalow which occupies a raised site above the highway within a predominantly residential area. The surrounding built form is varied in character and design. The proposal would result in the introduction of a first floor level to the property, with additional accommodation within the roof resulting from front and rear dormers and a gabled roof design.
5. Whilst front dormers are not common features in the locality, the proposed dormers would be relatively small and would not dominate the appearance of the roof. Additionally, the immediate area, including the adjacent dwellings, typically comprises of properties of a minimum height of two stories. The proposed increase in height of the dwelling and introduction of dormers would not therefore harm the character of the area in this regard.
6. However, the appeal site is restricted in overall size, with a very limited rear garden area. The existing bungalow, whilst of a generous width, is commensurate with the size of the plot. To the contrary, the resultant dwelling would be of a considerable scale and mass for its limited plot.

7. Although some garden space to the front would remain, this would only be a small area and the parking area with retaining wall behind would dominate the front of the site. Overall, there would be considerably limited undeveloped space within the site to off-set the total mass of the proposal. As such, it would appear cramped within the site and read as overdevelopment as a whole.
8. The prominent and elevated positioning of the appeal site would mean the resultant dwelling and overall excessive quantum of built development on the site would be readily apparent from the public realm. It would therefore appear as an incongruous feature in the locality.
9. Consequently, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policy P10 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) Leeds Local Plan (adopted November 2014, amended September 2019) and saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) Volume 1: Written Statement. Along with Policy HGD1 of the Householder Design Guide, Leeds Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document (April 2012), these policies and guidance collectively seek to ensure that developments are of a high-quality design that is appropriate to its context, amongst other things.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations which indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

H Ellison
INSPECTOR