



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2022

by M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3303942

21 Sholebroke Mount, Potternewton, Leeds LS7 3HG

- 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 Jamila Riaz against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02806/FU, dated 14 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is construction of front dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property (No 21) is a brick built, mid-terraced house in a residential area presently served by existing rooflights to the front. The houses along Sholebroke Mount are of two different designs: those with pitched gables to the front elevation, mainly found on the northern side of the street, and those like the appeal property, with a traditional, pitched slate roof.
4. Sholebroke Mount has a pleasing and interesting streetscape formed by traditional gables, bay windows, decorative corbels, and detailing surrounding the lintels on the houses. The substantial chimneys on the southern side of the street, where No 21 is located, provides a rhythm to the roofscape. This is only disturbed by the dormer extension at No 23, the neighbouring property to the appeal site.
5. The proposed dormer would be centred within the front roof slope and would be relatively modest in size when compared to the dormer in place at No 23. It would nevertheless form an unsympathetic and visually prominent addition to the roof. Moreover, the combination of two dormers on adjoining properties, in contrast to the unbroken roofscapes either side, would exacerbate and draw attention to the incongruous nature of the proposed development in this location. Thus, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
6. The proposal would not accord with Policies P10 and P12 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy (2014), as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019, or with saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development

Plan Review (2006), in so far as these policies seek to achieve design appropriate to the character and quality of the area and the overall townscape. 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) in so far as it sets out that extensions or alterations which harm the character and appearance of the main dwelling or the locality will be resisted.

Conclusion

7. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR