



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2020 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/19/3242403

46 Chatsworth Crescent, Stanningley, Pudsey, Leeds LS28 8LD

- 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 Noreen Akhtar against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/06023/FU, dated 26 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as dormers to property and single storey extension to rear.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. At the time of my visit, it was evident that building work had taken place. A dormer window and extension had been constructed to the rear. Two roof lights had been inserted to the front as well as a hip to gable roof extension. There are differences between that development and the plans before me. For the avoidance of doubt, I will determine the appeal on the basis of the plans that are before me.
4. The Council raised no objection to the proposed single storey rear extension or the rear dormer. Given their position to the rear of the property, those elements would not be prominent from public vantage points and I see no reason to take a different view. The appellant has not specifically requested that a split decision is issued granting permission for those elements in the event that the front dormer is considered unacceptable. Given that, and the fact that an alternative form of development appears to have been undertaken, I have not considered that option and have assessed the appeal based on the main issue in dispute which is the front dormer.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed front dormer on the character and appearance of the host building and area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. No. 46 is a semi-detached bungalow located within a residential area. Properties within Chatsworth Crescent display a strong character and simple rhythm. The semi-detached bungalows are set back from the highway behind a small garden, separated by driveways and the main garden is to the rear.
7. From the evidence before me, the host building previously had a hipped roof which matched the adjoining property. No. 46 and 44 are symmetrical with both having a front facing gable. The Council's Householder Design Guide (2012) provides advice relating to the design of dormer windows and represents good design practice. Amongst other things, it states that dormers should ideally be located to the rear of the property and should not dominate the roof plane or unbalance the existing dwelling. Where dormers are permitted to the front, they should be small and well designed to retain the existing roof form.
8. The proposed dormer would be a prominent, unsympathetic addition which would dominate the roof plane and unbalance the symmetry between the pair of semi-detached bungalows. The front dormer would draw the eye and would be visually harmful to the external appearance of the host building because of its size and scale. Although it would be set down marginally from the ridgeline and in from the eaves, those concessions would not be sufficient to mitigate against the scale of the dormer or its box-like appearance.
9. The appellant asserts that the proposed dormer is similar to others within the local area. On my site visit I did observe a number of other dormers located on front elevations. However, in general, these were smaller than the dormer proposed and were also situated on properties with a simpler roofscape, without a front facing gable. One example, at No. 34 Chatsworth Crescent, does have a large front dormer on a similar property with a projecting front gable. However, no information is before me as to when or if planning permission was granted for that structure which appears to be of some vintage and is likely to have been erected before current policy and design guidelines were in force. I find the design and proportions to be unsympathetic to the scale of the property and the presence of that example should not dictate that further harmful development should be allowed, particularly having regard to current policy and guidance. The front dormer would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the area due to its siting, scale and design.
10. For these reasons, the proposed development would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and area. Consequently, the scheme would conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (adopted 2014, amendments adopted 2019), saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006), guidance in the Householder Design Guide (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework. These Policies seek, amongst other matters, to promote good design which is appropriate for its context.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree and conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR