
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2020

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/19/324407

45 Chatsworth Road, Stanningley, Pudsey, Leeds LS28 8JX

- 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 Mrs Naheed Kausar against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/06020/FU, dated 26 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is dormers to front and rear of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed front dormers on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow. It is situated in a predominantly residential area. The section of Chatsworth Road on which the appeal site is located, running from its junction with Galloway Lane to Chatsworth Fall, comprises similar semi-detached bungalows and semi-detached dwellings. The appeal site is part of a linear row of eight semi-detached bungalows. There are also two similar bungalows before the junction with Chatsworth Fall however these are angled away from the building line of the other eight. Some of the run of eight bungalows have rear dormer windows however none have front dormer windows.
4. The Council raise no objection to the proposed rear dormer window which they have commented would be constructed under householder permitted development rights. It is the front dormers only that are cited in the reason for refusal.
5. There are two dormer windows proposed to the front elevation. Despite each being set back from the eaves, down from the ridge, and in from the sides of the front roof slope, due to the lack of front dormers to this row of bungalows they would be highly visible and prominent in the street-scene. They would unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties which currently display a clear sense of balance and symmetry when viewed from the street.

6. In relation to the scale, form and bulk of the proposed dormer windows, they would unreasonably dominate the roofscape and the front elevation of the property to the extent that the appearance of the dwelling would be harmed.
7. I note the presence of other dormer windows in surrounding streets, including those brought to my attention by the appellant. I do not have full details of these cases, and I must consider the appeal on its own individual merits. The appellant considers that the proposal in the context of these existing dormers is acceptable. I find that the other dormers are predominantly to properties where the street-scene has been heavily altered by roof alterations. Some of the examples serve to confirm that poorly designed dormer windows do harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. On this section of Chatsworth Road, there is not an overwhelming predominance of existing front dormer windows and they are certainly not part of the character of the street. The existence of other front dormer windows in the locality does not justify the harm I have identified.
8. The lack of harm to residential amenity, as put forward by the appellant, does not justify the harm I have identified.
9. The proposed dormer windows to the front elevation would therefore have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and be contrary to Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (2014) and saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006). These policies seek, amongst other things, to promote good design and ensure the size, scale, design and layout of development is appropriate to its context and respects the character and quality of surrounding buildings.
10. The proposed dormer windows to the front elevation would also be contrary to guidance contained in Policy HDG1 of the Leeds Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012). This guidance outlines that extensions, additions and alterations should respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality with particular attention being paid to roof form and roof line. The guidance also outlines that extensions or alterations which harm the character and appearance of the main dwelling or the locality will be resisted.
11. The proposed dormer windows to the front elevation would also be contrary to guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) which outlines that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available to improve the character and quality of an area, taking into account any local design standards or supplementary planning documents.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR