The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2017

by David Cross BA (Hons), PGDip, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 11 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/16/3162195
25 Denton Avenue, Gledhow, Leeds, W. Yorks LS8 1LE

- 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 Mohammed Ramzan against the decision of Leeds City Council.
- The application Ref 16/04467/FU, dated 30 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 September 2016.
- The development proposed is stated on the application form as "retrospective extension to front dormer (about 900mm)".

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, construction works at the appeal property were underway and the dormer window appeared to be substantially complete. I also note that the planning application was submitted retrospectively. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one of a pair of substantial semi-detached dwellings which have roofs of differing design. The adjoining property of 23 Denton Avenue has a steep sided gable projecting beyond the front roof slope which would appear to be part of the original dwelling. The pair of dwellings including the appeal site generally mirrors the design of the neighbouring properties of 19 & 21 Denton Avenue which contain similar gable and dormer features. However, whilst there are a variety of styles of design of dwellings and roofs in the area, in the wider area I saw that the prevalence of dormer windows on the front elevations of properties in the area is limited.

5. The Council and the appellant agree that the original dormer reflected that on the adjacent pair of dwellings i.e. the extant dormer on No 19. Notwithstanding this, I also note that the Council contend that the original dormer on the appeal property was an incongruous feature within the context

of the surrounding area. Based on my observations on my site visit, I agree with the Council that flat roofed dormers of the form of those on Nos 25 and 19 do not reflect the wider character of the area and appear as incongruous features within the street scene.

6. Whilst the size of the proposed extension may be relatively small, the original flat roofed dormer would already have been an incongruous and prominent feature on the front elevation of the property and within the street scene. The increase in the width of the dormer will exacerbate this harm to the original building, resulting in an overdominant feature which will be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. Furthermore, in comparison to the continuous and symmetrical glazing of the dormer on No 19, the irregular fenestration and the use of tiles between the windows gives the proposed dormer a heavy and overbearing appearance.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposal will harm the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. The proposal would therefore conflict with policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy 2014 and saved policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan 2006 in respect of the design of alterations and extensions. These policies are broadly consistent with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework with regards to securing high quality design. The proposal would also conflict with the advice of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document which states that extensions or alterations which harm the character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality will be resisted.

8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, it is concluded that the appeal is dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR