
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2020 by C McDonagh BA (Hons), MA

by Chris Hoult BA(Hons) BPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/19/3239547

17 Mayville Street, Hyde Park, Leeds, LS6 1ND

- 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 Aziz against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/04969/FU, dated 5 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'retrospective dormer to front'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The original planning application was determined on a retrospective basis by the Council. At the site visit, it was clear the development has been completed and as such, I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a two-storey, mid-terrace "back-to-back" dwelling of red brick construction in a residential area comprised largely of similar terraced properties. The dormer subject of this appeal is clad in dark tiles similar to those of the roof and features white windows matching those of the property.
6. My attention is drawn to the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) which seeks through policy HDG1 to ensure extensions, additions and alterations respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality. In this case, particular regard is had to the consideration of the roof form and roof line.

7. While the dormer is set down from the ridge, it extends nearly the full width of the roof and despite the plans indicating a slight set-back from the eaves, it appears flush with the front elevation of the property when viewed from street level. In visual terms, this gives the impression that no roof slope remains between the eaves and the dormer. This adds significant and unnecessary bulk to the dormer, giving it a dominant and top-heavy appearance, and changes the character and appearance of the appeal property by significantly altering the original roof form. As a result, and despite the use of matching materials to those of the host property, the dwelling now appears more as a three-storey dwelling with a virtually continuous front elevation from ground floor level to the dormer causing harm to the street scene.
8. As the appellant contends, during the site visit it was clear that a large proportion of the houses on Mayville Street and surrounding streets have dormer windows which vary in scale, design and appearance. This has altered roof lines and forms in the street scene. Notwithstanding this, from what I saw during my visit, many of these appear smaller in scale and/or include significant setbacks from the ridge and eaves. I note the submission of photographs and a list of other approved dormers in the vicinity. However, there is no way of knowing, from the evidence, how they relate to each other or to which properties the photographs relate. Nor have I any substantive information on the list of approvals, such as application details or plans.
9. The most notable nearby example visible on my visit was at 2 Mayville Street. However, given the age of that application, which pre-dates the adoption of the Leeds Core Strategy (CS) (2014) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I give this limited weight in so far as it might be claimed to set any kind of "precedent" for other development.
10. I therefore conclude that the dormer window is contrary to policies P10 of the CS, BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (UDPR) (2006), HDG1 of the SPD (2012) and advice contained within paragraph 127 of the Framework. Collectively, these seek to ensure extensions are of high-quality design and respectful of the original scale of their hosts, including their roof form, while being sympathetic to local character.

Recommendation

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

C McDonagh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

C M Hoult

INSPECTOR