



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2023

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3315770

2 Brookside, Alwoodley, Leeds LS17 8TD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Haidar against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/07219/FU, dated 26 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is alterations including raising roof height to create first floor with dormer windows and rooflights to front and rear, two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for alterations including raising roof height to create first floor with dormer windows and rooflights to front and rear, two storey side extension and single storey rear extension at 2 Brookside, Alwoodley, Leeds LS17 8TD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/07219/FU, dated 26 October 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 approved plans: Location Plan Drawing No. 001; Proposed Block Plan Drawing No. 003 Revision C; Existing and Proposed Elevations Drawing No. 004 Revision M; Existing & Proposed Plans Drawing No. 005 Revision N.
 - 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.
 - 4) The front and cheeks of the dormers shall be constructed of matching roof tiles to match the existing roof of the property.

Procedural Matters

2. Planning permission has previously been granted for alterations including raising roof height to create first floor with dormer windows to front and rear, two storey side extension and single storey rear extension under reference 20/04259/FU. The approved scheme is extant, and works have commenced on the site. This remains a significant fallback position and is a material consideration in my decision. The difference between the previously approved

scheme and the appeal before me relates to alterations to the roof to form a hipped end which would also require alteration/additions to the rooflights.

3. I was able to see that the works that have already taken place do not fully accord with the drawings submitted as part of this appeal. I have therefore determined the appeal based on the submitted plans.
4. The description of development in the above banner heading has been taken from the appeal form and decision notice which takes into account the works previously approved under reference 20/04259/FU.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property relates to a detached one and two storey property located within a residential setting. Surrounding properties are set back from the road within large plots that are well landscaped and comprise reasonably large, detached bungalows or two storey properties with the second floor set within the roof of the property. While the overall layout and appearance is reasonably consistent, I observed a number of different roof styles and configurations including varied height differences between properties.
7. The host property already benefits from an extant planning permission for alterations including raising roof height to create first floor with dormer windows to front and rear, two storey side extension and single storey rear extension with works taken place onsite. This consent whilst only allowing part of the dwelling to be raised in height would add substantial height and volume to the building allowing it to sit above its neighbour at No 4 Brookside and the other more modest bungalows located along this side of the street.
8. The hipped roof would slope away from the boundary with No 4, reducing the overall bulk of the development. This would still appear as a subordinate feature and would be no more harmful than what was previously approved.
9. The Council raise concern regarding the overall roof form appearing dominant and unbalanced particularly given the hipped roof feature on one end and a pitched roof to the other side. However, some unbalancing already exists by the previous consent granted along with an abrupt change in roof form from two storey to single storey. When viewed from the east, a number of roof forms would therefore exist which is confusing on the eye, and I am persuaded by the evidence submitted by the appellant relating to the reduction in the complexity of the roof form by introducing the hip feature.
10. Additionally, the dwelling is located back from the pavement and the landscaping surrounding the site would help to screen the development from views on approaching the site along Brookside and views of the proposed development are only really apparent when viewed from the direct north and east of the site. As a result, the changes proposed have a very limited effect upon the street scene and given the presence of other varied roof styles and heights nearby some of which include a hip feature means that it would not be particularly prominent or dominate the overall appearance of the area nor be uncomfortable within its context.

11. I note concerns raised regarding the use of roof lights. However, such features reflect those already approved elsewhere on the main property and would not be particularly harmful to the character and appearance of the host property or surrounding area given their limited overall size and positioning within the roof.
12. I conclude that, when viewed in the context of the extant permission, the development would not appear as an unduly prominent addition and would not cause unacceptable harm to the host property or surrounding area. Accordingly, I find the proposed development to accord with Policies P10 and P12 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) and Policy HDG1 of the Leeds City Council Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, 2012. Amongst other things, these collectively require all extensions, additions and alterations to respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality. The proposed development would also accord with chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to achieving well-designed places.

Other Matters

13. Concerns have been raised relating to the impact on living conditions of existing residents on Alwoodley Chase in relation to light, outlook and privacy. The differences between the extant permission and the proposal are relatively minor and would not give rise to any greater degree of harm. I am content that development would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbours.
14. Concern has also been raised regarding previous planning permissions and the works that have taken place onsite. However, these matters are outside the scope of the appeal and therefore have had no bearing on my decision.
15. My attention has been drawn to a previous appeal at the site associated with reference 14/06267/FU. However, it is clear that this previous appeal was dismissed prior to the Council approving subsequent alterations at the site and thus the site context is indeed different which is a significant material consideration in this instance.

Conditions

16. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council including the standard time for commencement of development which I have applied. I also agree that a plans condition is necessary in the interests of certainty. A condition relating to materials and roof tiles of the dormer windows is also required in the interests of the satisfactory appearance of the development. I have amended condition 4 to make clear that the tiles are to match the existing roof.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the development plan as a whole, the appeal should be allowed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR