



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2022

by M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3298344

1 East View, Pudsey LS28 8NL

- 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 Mark Ellse against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/10164/FU, dated 17 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "new dormer roof extension and 2No velux roof windows."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the site and the area.

Reasons

3. No 1 East View is at the end of a short row of stone built, terraced houses, located on a gravel track with no through access. The gable-end of the property is positioned directly onto the back edge of the pavement that runs alongside the road, Fartown. The dwelling immediately adjoins another terrace which faces directly onto the same road. No 1 is an attractive, double-fronted, period house with a stone tiled roof, and stone features including chimneys, corbels, and a stone pediment over the door.
4. Nos 1 and 2 East View currently have an unbroken roofscape framed by the two stone chimneys on either side of the roof. The rear elevation and roof slope are largely obscured from the road by the adjoining terrace.
5. The proposal would involve the conversion of the roof-space to provide a single bedroom. The proposed front dormer extension would cover most of the front roof, resulting in the removal of the majority of the traditional stone roof tiles. The roof-lights on the rear roof-slope would be very discretely positioned, obscured by the dwelling at No 134.
6. The proposed expansive flat roof of the dormer, which would almost reach the apex of the original roof, would create a top-heavy development, out of proportion to the original house. It would have cumbersome white coloured side cheeks that make no reference to the existing house. These would appear domineering and disproportionate to the house and the adjoining terraces.

7. The extensive glazing along the front would be of an overly modern style which would not relate to the existing traditional window positions and glazing patterns on the house. The dormer would therefore appear oversized, creating an unbalanced and incongruous feature to the roofscape which would harm the character of the house in a prominent position when seen from Fartown.
8. The appellant makes reference to the house being located within an area where there are buildings of varying periods and types so that the proposal would not detract from the general characteristics of the area. I observed the variety of buildings when visiting the site. Notwithstanding this, No 1 East View with its historic features, makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. The position and orientation of the front of the house, visible from Fartown, means that the proposed dormer would be visually dominant.
9. In relation to the main issue, the proposed development would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the site and the area. The proposal would not comply with Policy P10 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019),¹¹ September 2019, which requires high quality design or saved policy BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review which covers alterations and extensions needing to respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building. Furthermore, the proposal would not adhere to the guidance in Policy HDG1 of The Leeds City Council, Householder Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document, April 2012 that dormer windows to the front are not normally considered acceptable, particularly in prominent locations and on unbroken roof slopes.

Other Matters

10. I accept that the proposal would be beneficial to the occupants of 1 East View by the provision of additional floorspace and accommodation. Although this is important to the appellant who wishes to remain at this property, it is of very limited public benefit and does not therefore outweigh my conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

11. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
12. For the reasons given above, I consider that the appeal should be dismissed.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR