



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2024

by N Kempton BAHons, PGDip, MA, IHBC, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3333817

107 Templegate Avenue, Halton, Leeds LS15 0HJ

- 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 Mr & Mrs J Reddington against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/05453/FU.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing dormer and construction of first floor rear extension, including new flat roof to ground floor extension; alterations to rear fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the interests of clarity, the description used in the above banner heading is taken from the decision notice and appeal form as this more accurately describes the works proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dormer bungalow with a generous, steeply pitched roof. It is located within a residential area. In the vicinity of the appeal site, there are a mix of bungalows and 2 storey dwellings, constructed of a mixed material palette.
5. Dwellings with dormer windows and incremental additions and alterations are evident in the street scene. In this part of Templegate Avenue, I observed that dormer windows are generally contained within the original roof slope, set in from the verges of the principal roof and set down from the ridge. Dormers project out from the central part of the roof slope, rather than rising directly from the eaves and being aligned with the rear wall of the dwelling. As such, dormers are subservient to the principal dwelling, the massing and roof form of which remains clearly legible.
6. Whilst I note that the proposal has been slightly reduced in size since a previously refused scheme, it would only be marginally set in from the roof verges, down from the ridge and back from the rear wall of the dwelling, and so would obscure the roof form and subsume the parent dwelling.

7. The scale and mass of the proposed extension would be a disproportionate addition to the single storey host property and would visually dominate it.
8. For these reasons, the proposed extension would not form a satisfactory composition, rather it would appear as a discordant feature, resulting in disharmony, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the dwelling.
9. The proposed materials would be similar to those found on the existing rear dormer and would match the roof. However, by reason of the scale, design, form and massing of the first-floor extension, it would not be legible as a dormer projecting from the roof. Therefore, tile cladding would appear incongruous.
10. Although located at the rear of the dwelling, I observed that the existing rear dormer is visible in places in the street scene. As the scale and mass of the proposed first-floor extension would be significantly greater, this would have a greater visible presence. Whilst I accept that in such views the proposal would not be visible in its entirety, the emphasis on good design in both national and local policies is not dependant on visibility from the public realm.
11. Alterations and extensions that include a number of flat roof dormers in the vicinity are noted. I am not familiar with the history of the dormer windows identified by the appellant, but the Council has confirmed that in most cases, these dormers are original features of the host dwelling, rather than retrofitted. Furthermore, these dormers predate the Council's current design guidance that provides specific guidance on alterations and extensions to dwellings. Whilst some of these dormers are large, they are contained within the original roof space and do not fill the entire roof slope as the proposal would do. Therefore, these dormers are not directly comparable with the appeal scheme and do not justify the harmful development proposed here. In any case, the proposed extension is not a dormer but a first-floor rear extension on a bungalow. Such extensions are not a common feature in the area and those I saw confirmed that such extensions are detrimental to both the host property and the surrounding area and so do not set a precedent to follow.
12. For these reasons, the proposed development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and the area. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to policies P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy 2019 and BD6 and GP5 the Leeds Saved Unitary Development Plan (2006). Taken together these require good contextual design, appropriate size, and for extensions to respect the scale and form of the original building.
13. The proposed development also conflicts with the aim of achieving well-designed and beautiful places identified in chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

14. The potential benefits to the appellants and occupiers of the appeal property arising from the proposed development are acknowledged, not least in addressing the structural condition of the appeal dwelling, and the issue of water ingress. However, the need to address these issues does not preclude good contextual design and so these issues do not justify the proposed development and the consequent I have identified it would cause. As such, I attribute little weight to these issues.

Conclusion

15. Notwithstanding the benefits to the appellants and occupiers of the appeal property, I have found that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole and there are no other considerations, which outweigh this finding.
16. The appeal is dismissed.

N Kempton

INSPECTOR