



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2023

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3323900

15 Sandhill Crescent, Leeds, West Yorkshire LS17 8DY

- 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 Imran Mahmood against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01010/FU, dated 6 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension; hip to mansard roof extension with dormer window to rear; roof lights to the front; demolition of the existing single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the description of development as stated on the Council's decision notice, rather than that given on the application form, as this is more precise. The appellant raises no specific objection to that description.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Sandhill Crescent is a residential street comprising a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings. While there is variety within the street as a whole, the appeal site forms part of a row of detached properties. Despite some differences in appearance, the detached properties are in general harmony with each other in terms of their character and appearance and there is manifest uniformity in the roofscape, owing to the consistency in hipped roofs which creates a clear sense of balance. This contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The creation of a hip to mansard roof would be an incongruous addition and a jarring element compared to the existing sloped hipped roof. It would be visually discordant, owing to the bulk of the roof and the failure to respond to the prevailing pattern of roofs on this side of Sandhill Crescent and would have an awkward presence in the street scene. While the proposed rear dormer would be set up from the eaves and set in from the sides, there would be no set down from the ridge, and the flat roof of the dormer would have a horizontal emphasis and boxy appearance. The resultant large scale would

dominate the roof, appearing as an overly prominent and bulky addition to the appeal property.

6. The appellant contends that the proposal would enhance the property while maintaining its original character. However, the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) 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 proposed rear dormer and the roof design 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 roof extensions, of which there are several, and therefore a feature of the wider area. It is suggested that they contribute positively to a more varied appearance in the locality. 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 property opposite the appeal site. As such, they are not directly comparable and the examples do not, therefore, lead me away from my above findings. There is said to be positive feedback from neighbours with regard to other similar schemes in the area, nevertheless, the proposed development would still be visually intrusive.
8. For the reasons given, the proposal would be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with Policy P10 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy selective Review 2019) and saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006). Amongst other things, these policies require development to provide good design that contributes to place making and is appropriate to its context, and alterations that respect the original building.
9. The proposal is also contrary to the guidance regarding extensions set out in the SPD, and contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to achieving well designed places.

Conclusion

10. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate that I should take a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR