



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2024 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3348123

56 Broom Terrace, Belle Isle, Leeds LS10 3JT

- 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 Waqas Aslam against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01078/FU.
 - The development proposed is gable to side and dormer window to rear (Including new maximum roof height)
-

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 dwelling and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey semi-detached property with a hipped roof. The adjoining property mirrors the site's two storey hipped roof form as does the immediate surrounding area, notably a further 2 pairs of semi-detached properties within the cul-de-sac where the appeal site is situated on Broom Terrace. The remainder of the street consists of similar two storey dwellings which create a generally consistent character to the area, with hipped roofs the predominant form of roof design.
5. The proposed dormer would result in an increase in ridge height, a hip to gable conversion and the occupation of the entirety of the rear roof slope. The resultant development would appear as a large, box-like, and dominant addition to the rear roof slope as well as adding significant bulk and height to the roof. This would substantially alter the existing dwelling's character and design.
6. The proposed extension to the roof would use appropriate materials for the property. However, it would not respond positively to the original architecture or roof form of the host building and would result in an unacceptable erosion of the uniform design quality of the area through the loss of the hipped roof form and ridge height symmetry.

7. The appeal property is clearly visible and prominent as viewed from Broom Terrace. The proposed works would break the existing uniformity of the pair of semi-detached dwellings, and because of its scale and awkward design, the works would appear as an incongruous feature within the street scene.
8. The appellant has referred to properties elsewhere on a different stretch of Broom Terrace with differing ridge heights. However, I observed these properties to be a different design of house to the appeal property and are therefore not directly comparable to the design of the appeal scheme. I also note there are no other dormers occupying the roof slopes of the hipped roof properties close to the appeal site nor any properties with altered ridge heights.
9. For the reasons as set out, the proposed hip to gable extension, raising of ridge height and dormer to the rear would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. As such it would fail to comply with Policy P10 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) and the Saved Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) policies GP5 and BD6 which require development to be compatible with the host property and the surrounding area.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has set out that the benefits of the proposal would include the provision of additional usable space. However, whilst this would undoubtedly be both a financial and logistical private benefit to the residents, this would not attract any significant weight in support of the development when considered against the identified harm.
11. I have also noted the appellant's comments outlining the absence of objections from neighbouring occupiers to the appeal scheme. Nevertheless, this would be a matter which would neither weigh in support nor against the development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

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.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR