

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2020

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3245172

31 Sutherland Terrace, Burmantofts, Leeds LS9 6DR

- 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 James D Axall against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/06349/FU, dated 9 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "Attic conversion from one bedroom to two bedroom dormer."
-

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 property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The surrounding area is characterised predominately by terraced properties. The appeal site is a mid-terrace dwelling with traditional architectural detailing. Dormer windows are present on other properties within the area however the majority retain the original modest roof slopes.
4. The proposal would introduce a large bulky addition which would result in the loss of the modest roof design. The proposal would be constructed up from the eaves and would cover most of the width of the property. The size of the dormer would make it a dominating feature that would not be subordinate to the scale of the host dwelling. Due to its scale, bulk and design, the proposed dormer would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
5. There are other dormers in the terrace, with the majority being of sensitive scale and design, which do not dominate the roof slopes. The proposed dormer would be a discordant feature that would dominate the roof design of the terrace and adversely affect the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
6. I find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal fails to comply with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy 2019, Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan 2006 and Policy HDG1 of the Leeds

Householder Design Guide 2012 which seeks proposals to respect the character and quality of surrounding buildings.

7. I have had regards to the appellants statement of case, including comments that the proposal is needed for family requirements and that the appellant is willing to use upvc cladding on the outside of the dormer. I have given careful consideration to all these matters when reaching my decision, but they do not lead me to a different overall conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

8. I conclude that for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR