



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 September 2023

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3322883

35 Cavendish Road, Guiseley, Leeds LS20 8DW

- 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 M Cooke against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01590/FU, dated 7 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is dormer roof extension to the rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, bearing in mind that it would be within the Guiseley Conservation Area (GCA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site accommodates a mid-terraced period property, constructed from stone and render with a steeply sloping red tile roof. While there are differences in appearance to the rear of properties along Cavendish Road, there is uniformity in the roofscape owing to the general absence of roof extensions. This creates a clear sense of balance which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. An exception to this is the neighbouring property to the appeal site which has a dormer extension. Nevertheless, the area is characterised as having a harmonious quality.
4. The site falls within the GCA. From my observations, the significance of the conservation area insofar as relevant to this case, is primarily derived from the architectural detailing and layout of the buildings within it. The appeal property with its distinctive steeply sloping roof makes a positive contribution to the conservation area.
5. The proposed rear dormer would be set up from the eaves, set down from the ridgeline and would have materials to match the existing roof. It would also safeguard amenity matters including privacy. However, the proposed development would be almost the full width of the appeal property and owing to its position on a steeply sloping roof, the flat roof of the dormer would have a horizontal emphasis and boxy appearance. The resultant large scale would dominate the roof. Moreover, it would have an awkward presence within the steeply sloping roof and in doing so, would not be in keeping with one of the main features of the original dwelling.

6. The Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2012) advises that the design and appearance of extensions should pay particular attention to the roof form and should respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality. The scale and form of the proposal would be conspicuous, unbalancing the generally harmonious roofscape and the proposed development would not relate positively to the appeal property or the prevailing character and appearance of the area.
7. I have considered the other examples of dormer extensions, of which there are several, and therefore a feature of the wider area. However, the context of the examples and the relationship with the street scene differs. The examples are not typically located in a section of the street where there is a general absence of roof extensions, nor are they comparable in size or appearance to the proposal, including the neighbouring dormer extension. As such, they are not directly comparable and the examples do not, therefore, lead me away from my above findings.
8. Overall, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the GCA and would harm its significance as a whole. The harm that I have identified is 'less than substantial' harm. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets, irrespective of the level of harm. Any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should also require a clear and convincing justification. The Framework also requires such harm to be weighed against any public benefits. There would be modest economic benefits arising from employment during the proposal's construction. However, this public benefit is insufficient to outweigh the great weight attached to the harm to the designated heritage asset.
9. For the reasons given, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, failing to preserve the GCA and harming its significance. The scheme is therefore in conflict with Policies P10, P11 and P12 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), and Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006). Amongst other things, these policies require new development to provide good design that respects the character and quality of surrounding buildings and streets, conserving and enhancing the historic environment and the character and quality of Leeds' townscapes to protect their distinctiveness.
10. The proposal is also contrary to the guidance regarding extensions set out in the SPD, and contrary to the provisions of the Framework in relation to achieving well designed places.

Conclusion

11. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that have been shown to have sufficient weight to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR