



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2023

by M Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3325528

6 Dover Street, Garforth, Leeds LS25 2LP

- 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 Jordan Allsop against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01916/FU, dated 23 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as 'dormer conversion'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the northern side of Dover Street within a row of similar properties. The property has a steep pitched roof with dormers to the front and rear roof slopes. It includes a flat roofed garage attached to the western side which abuts the boundary with 8 Dover Street. There is a driveway and garden to the front of the property and a larger garden to the rear.
4. The surrounding area is of established residential character with mainly semi-detached two storey dwellings of varied design. Although some properties on Dover Street have single storey side extensions, the semi-detached pairs generally have spacious and broadly even gaps between them, particularly at first floor level, which provides a sense of openness and contributes positively to the character of the area.
5. The appeal proposal is a first-floor side extension which, like the existing garage below, would extend up to the boundary with No 8. It would be set back a small distance from the existing front elevation of the property with a corresponding set down from the existing ridge of the property. Dormers would be added to the front and rear roof slopes of the extension which would be set in from the side wall and set back from the existing dormers.
6. As a result of its form and design, including the set back from the existing front elevation of the property and lower ridge line, the proposed extension would appear subservient to the host property. However, the lack of relief between the side of the extension and the boundary with No 8 would result in a cramped appearance and the loss of some of the visual gap between the two

properties, which is a defining characteristic of properties on this street. It would also lead to a potential terracing effect with No 8, should the latter ever be extended to the side in the future. This would be harmful to the character of the properties and the street scene.

7. Whilst the proposal would remove the existing flat roofed structure to the side of the property, I observed during my site visit that this is a modest addition which is typical of other flat roofed garages in the wider area. Consequently, it does not significantly detract from the character and appearance of the property or the area and the removal of the flat roof does not provide sufficient justification for the proposed extension.
8. The appellant has referred to examples of other side extensions in the area. However, I do not have details of the planning history or circumstances which led to the approval of these other extensions. Moreover, each property inevitably has a surrounding context specific to it rather than to the appeal site. Accordingly, I have determined the appeal proposal on its own merits and do not find that the presence of other developments in the wider area outweighs or alters my findings above.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would conflict with saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan 2006, Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy 2019, and Policy HDG1 of the Leeds City Council Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012. Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that extensions and alterations are of an appropriate scale, form and design to the existing building and the wider context. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure that development is well-designed and sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

10. The Council considers that the proposal would not adversely affect neighbouring occupiers' living conditions. I have no reason to disagree with that assessment on the basis of the evidence before me and my observations on site. However, that is a neutral matter which does not weigh positively in favour of the scheme.
11. Whilst I sympathise with the appellant's desire to create additional living space, including a new study for the purposes of home working, this is a private benefit which does not outweigh the visual harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

12. The proposal does not accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR