



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 November 2020 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3260098

47 Harehills Avenue, Chapeltown, LEEDS LS8 4EX

- 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 Sariya Bi against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02661/FU, dated 5 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is 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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 47 Harehills Avenue and the wider area.

Reasons

4. 47 Harehills Road is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a shared central gable. The character of the area is mix of terraced and semi-detached dwellings, of varying styles and materials but with either shared or separate gable features on the roof.
5. The adjoining property, 45 Harehills Road has an expansive box dormer to the front elevation, which extends the full width of the property and is flush with the front elevation. The appeal proposal would create a matching dormer, with the intention of rebalancing the visual appearance of the dwellings.
6. My attention is drawn to the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which advises through policy HDG1 that all extensions, additions and alterations should respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality. Particular attention should be paid to the roof form and roof line, among other factors.
7. Whilst the appellant's desire to recreate a balanced and symmetrical appearance is understood, the resultant dormer would extend the full width of

the property, without any set back, creating a bulky and over dominant feature on the property which, in addition, would almost completely eliminate the form and definition of the original pitched roof and the gable which is a positive design feature of the building. It would also include a large window with a horizontal emphasis which would not replicate the vertical emphasis of the existing windows on the front elevation of the property. Due to the prominent position of the proposal on the front elevation it would also be visible from public vantage points and would therefore cause harm to the character of the street scene.

8. My attention is drawn to other similar dormers in the vicinity, which I saw on the site visit, including dormers to the same style of property. I understand that not all of these dormers have the benefit of planning permission and it seems to me that they are not necessarily good examples of development to follow. Moreover, they do not define the prevailing character of the area. Accordingly, the existence of other front dormer extensions in the locality does not justify the harm I have identified to the character and appearance both the host dwelling and of the surrounding area. In any event, I have determined this appeal on the site specific circumstances of this case.
9. In conclusion, the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of 47 Harehills Avenue and the wider area. As such, it would not comply with Policy P10 of Leeds City Council Core Strategy 92014), saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) and the SPD which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that alterations are of an appropriate scale and design to the existing building and the wider context.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR