



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2024 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3345409

Tolcan, 25 Peasehill Close, Rawdon, Leeds LS19 6EF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Georgina Goodale against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01607/FU.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Additional rendered storey on existing bungalow footprint, infill to front elevation and new porch. Trussed roof to match existing. PV to roof. New garage and office'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site occupies a prominent position at end of Peasehill Close, where Peasehill Close meets Peasehill Park. The street scene features a mix of properties including two-storey houses and bungalows of varied size and design, some of which have been extended. The appeal site features a detached bungalow which displays a pleasing symmetry to its front elevation and consistency in terms of its hipped roof forms which give the bungalow a well-balanced, high-quality aesthetic. The bungalow is setback from the street and benefits from a generous plot with a large rear garden. There are trees and hedges along the boundaries and a large tree within the front garden area. As a result of all these factors, 'Tolcan' provides a positive focal point at the end of Peasehill Close.
5. Due to their ridges being set only marginally below the eaves of the first floor and their hipped roof design, the front projections would jar with the gabled forms of the main roof. They would read as remnants of the existing dwelling rather than being well integrated into the design of the extended dwelling and this would give the development an incoherent appearance. Consequently, the lack of continuity in design does not respect the form of the existing dwelling,

- nor does it create a visually appealing new composition, and this would provide a poor focal point at the end of Peasehill Close.
6. Moreover, other than matching materials, the rear elevation would be of a different style to the front. The shallow pitch and considerable width of the proposed rear gable would appear contrived as a response to spanning the broad width of the existing bungalow's footprint. The ridge of the side gables would sit level with that of the rear gable creating an unappealing bulky aesthetic. The variety of window fenestration sizes and alignments on the rear elevation would appear disorderly. In combination these factors would compound the inconsistencies in the design approach.
 7. The rear elevation would be noticeable from a number of neighbouring properties. In any event, the location of the rear elevation away from the street does not overcome my overall design concerns and I do not consider that any lack of public visibility obviates the needs to achieve good design. Indeed, paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that the creation of high-quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.
 8. The proposal would therefore have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and on the surrounding area. The proposal would conflict with Policy P10 (Design) of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (as amended 2019) and Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) which require amongst other things that the size, scale, design and layout of the development is appropriate to its context, protects the visual amenity of the area through high quality design and that alterations and extensions respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original dwelling.
 9. For the same reasons, the proposal would also conflict with the guidance within Policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012), which requires that extensions and alterations respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and locality.

Other Matters

10. I am aware that planning permission was granted for 'Part single storey, part two storey extensions, raise in roof height forming two storey dwelling with rooms in roof space' at the site in 2020 (application ref 20/01498/FU). This permission was not implemented and has since lapsed; hence it does not constitute a fallback position. Furthermore, even if the development plan policies have not changed since that particular application was approved by the Council, from what I have seen the proposed front and rear elevations in that instance were of a more holistic design. Therefore, the appeal scheme before me is not directly comparable, and the planning history of the site does not alter my conclusion in respect of the harm identified under the main issue.
11. The appellant suggests that the current dwelling has a leaking roof and that the layout is not ideal for the family. It is also indicated that the extended dwelling would be more energy efficient as it would be better insulated and would incorporate renewable energy features. However, there is nothing before me to

suggest that these matters could only be addressed and provided through the appeal scheme.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed since it would conflict with the development plan.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR