



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2022

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3294685

46 East View, Yeadon, Leeds LS19 7AD

- 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 & Ms Zolfaghary & Armitage against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/08256/FU, dated 4 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is extension to side and dormers to front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The side extension did not feature in the Council's refusal reasons, and it would appear that planning permission has previously been granted for that element of the scheme.
3. Therefore, the main issue in this appeal is whether the proposed dormer windows would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Yeadon Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies within the Yeadon Conservation Area (the CA). The CA is reflective of the area's industrial heritage and draws some of its essential character and significance from the streets of traditional 19th century terraced housing that define much of the historic townscape. The simple terraced building containing the appeal property is typical of this character, and as such contributes to the character and appearance of the CA and its significance as a designated heritage asset.
5. The appeal property is located at the end of the terraced building, which together with the deep front gardens of the houses further to the north, results in the entire side elevation being visible. As a consequence, both of the proposed dormers would be highly prominent in the street scene, and despite being set in marginally from the edges of the roof, would be wide and bulky structures that would subsume the majority of the original sloping roof planes of the appeal property. Furthermore, their flat roof form and fenestration design would not reflect the proportions and fenestration of the existing building. Therefore, both individually and when taken together, the dormers would dominate and detract from the original form and simple design characteristics of the appeal property and terraced block. Cladding the dormers with hanging tiles would not overcome these harmful effects.

6. I have taken into account that there are already a number of existing flat roof dormers along East View. However, I have no information on whether these preceded the CA designation, or even whether any benefit from planning permission. In any case, the proposed dormers would be larger and more prominent, and I have found that they would be harmful for their own specific reasons.
7. I conclude that the proposed dormer windows would have an adverse visual effect on the terraced building and would diminish its contribution to the significance of the CA as a result. Consequently, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA as a whole. Whilst the harm to the CA would be classed as less than substantial, there are no public benefits identified which would outweigh that harm. Thus, the proposal conflicts with the design and heritage requirements of Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (amended 2019), saved Policy GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds City Council Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006), and Policy HDG1 of the Council's 'Householder Design Guide' Supplementary Planning Document (2012). The proposal is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) with regards to achieving well designed places, as well as conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal fails to accord with the relevant policies of the development plan and the Framework. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR