The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2020

**by Patrick Hanna MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 19th June 2020**

**Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3246033**
**1 Lowther Street, Harehills, Leeds LS8 5PH**

- 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 Raqia Akhtar against the decision of Leeds City Council.
- The application Ref 19/05319/FU, dated 27 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 December 2019.
- The development proposed is dormers to front.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey, back-to-back, terraced dwelling, constructed in red brick with slate roof, and a single pitched-roof dormer. Lowther Street and the surrounding area are characterised by narrow streets of generally uniform appearance, mostly with single dormers. The effect of the proposal would be to introduce two flat-roofed dormers across almost the full width of the roof, tight to the front roof edge, which would create a top-heavy appearance to the front elevation, in poor contrast to the existing roofscape along the street.

4. The existing dormers in the locality are predominantly positioned such that they align vertically with the lower windows or doors, unlike the proposed eastern dormer which would be askew. As such, the proposal would disrupt the existing rhythm of fenestration along the terrace. The roof plan shows a large single dormer which would, if implemented, result in an even more dominating roofline. Whilst unsympathetic dormers do exist in the surrounding area, they are not so numerous as to inform the character of the area and do not justify a further erosion of the character of the street scene.

5. In conclusion, the proposed dormers would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, contrary to policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (2019), saved policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006), and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal is also contrary to the Household Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) which,

whilst the relevant sections have not been provided as part of the current appeal, are known to me from a separate but concurrent appeal. Together these policies require that new development be based on a thorough contextual analysis and provide good design that is appropriate to its location.

*Other matters*

6. The appellant refers to consistency of decision making and dormers that were previously permitted in 2011. However, the development plan policy framework has changed since then and that previous permission does not outweigh my above findings against the current policy framework and the harm that would be caused. Although section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is cited, it is not within my remit to reconsider the duration of that previous permission, rather I must determine the current appeal on its merits.

**Conclusion**

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

*Patrick Hanna*

INSPECTOR