



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2025

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3358115

23 Kelmscott Lane, Manston, Leeds LS15 8JP

- 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 Sophie Peel against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/04481/FU.
 - The development proposed is roof replacement with raised ridge height, hip to gable conversions and rear dormer window. Single storey rear extension.
-

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 host building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is part of a pleasant suburban streetscape primarily consisting of detached and semi-detached dwellings. Although there is some variation in the designs of houses, including some roof alterations, the use of hipped roofs of a relatively consistent pitch is a characteristic of the streetscape.
4. The proposal includes the raising of the ridge height of the roof of the host dwelling. Based on evidence submitted by the appellant and my own observations, the increase in the height of the roof would reflect that of the neighbouring houses.
5. However, the proposal would also lead to an increase in the pitch of the roof, which would jar uncomfortably with the shallower roof pitches of dwellings within the streetscape. The introduction of gables in contrast to the prevailing hipped roof form would add to this incongruous appearance.
6. The proposal also includes a large dormer that would cover much of the rear roofslope, and which would be an overdominant box-like addition to the building. The awkward placement of the windows would exacerbate the clumsy appearance of the dormer, as would the loss of part of the eaves of the roof which would add to the stark effect of the proposal on the rear elevation. The set-back of the dormer from the ridge and eaves of the main roof would do little to mitigate for the overdominant effect on the rear of the dwelling.
7. Due to the arrangement of the appeal site, only the sides of the dormer would be readily visible from the street. But even then, the bulk and scale of the dormer would add to the incongruous appearance of the other roof alterations. In any

event, the obtrusive appearance and scale of the dormer would be apparent from the rear of nearby properties.

8. The appellant refers to examples of similar extensions in the surrounding area. However, it has not been demonstrated that these are a direct parallel to the appeal proposal including in respect of design and the effect on the pitch of the roof. Furthermore, examples of roof alterations to dwellings on Kelmscott Lane served to confirm the visual harm that can arise from the introduction of gables and rear dormers of a significant scale and convoluted design. The examples referred to by the appellant do not lead me to a different conclusion on the harm arising from the appeal proposal.
9. I conclude that due to its design and scale, that the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with the design and character requirements of Policy P10 of the Core Strategy 2019 (as amended) and Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice of the Householder Design Guide 2012 in respect of the design and appearance of extensions, particularly with regards to the roof form.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR