
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2021

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/21/3279543

16 Wadlands Drive, Farsley, Pudsey LS28 5JS

- 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 Sian Sahota against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02003/FU, dated 9 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a Front Dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for a Front Dormer extension at 16 Wadlands Drive, Farsley, Pudsey LS28 5JS in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/02003/FU dated 9 March 2021 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, WD/2021/EXT/01 Rev.0, WD/2021/EXT/02 Rev.0, WD/2021/EXT/03 Rev.0 & WD/2021/EXT/04 Rev.0.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has been altered from the application form to the decision notice. That on the application form adequately describes the proposal, however I have omitted superfluous wording that is not a description of development relating to the suggested merits of the case. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area in relation to its scale, form, and massing.

Reasons

4. The proposal relates to a bungalow which incorporates accommodation within its roof space. The property is set on Wadlands Drive which is within a residential area and which hosts modern detached bungalows which incorporate mixed materials and finishes. The result is a pleasant street scene, but not one which is especially cohesive or unique.

5. The window arrangement within the dormer would align well with the ground floor window below and would match its three-pane form. Further, the dormer would occupy only a limited section of the front roof slope and would be set well in from the edge of the roof on the side it would be positioned while being set up from the eaves and down from the ridgeline. It would not dominate the front roof slope of the property.
6. The proposal would therefore accord with much of the guidance on dormer windows outlined in the SPD¹. However, the SPD does advise that dormer windows to the front will not normally be considered acceptable. The property is not located particularly prominently being on a quiet cul-de-sac but other than one historic front dormer the front roof slopes are largely unbroken on the street.
7. The provision of a front dormer would therefore result in some conflict with the details of the SPD guidance. However, the property and area specific circumstances along with the design of the dormer window mean that it would be acceptable in terms of its scale, form and massing. Ultimately, the proposal would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling or area.
8. The proposal would not therefore conflict with Policy P10 of the Core Strategy Selective Review (2019) (CS) which amongst other things requires that development respects the character and quality of an area. Further, the proposal would not conflict with Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) which amongst other things require resolution on design issues and that alterations and extensions respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building.
9. The proposal would not conflict with Policy HDG1 of the SPD which requires that extensions, additions and alterations respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and locality. I have not identified conflict with the Framework².

Conditions

10. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three year time limit. It is necessary that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. A condition relating to details of materials is not necessary as these are clearly detailed on the application form.

Conclusion

11. I have identified no conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR

¹ Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document April 2012.

² National Planning Policy Framework 2021.