



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/22/3306311

36 Bexley Terrace, Harehills, Leeds LS8 5NX

- 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 Najma Kosar against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03703/FU, dated 24 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is dormer windows to front.
-

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 host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The area is characterised by streets of traditional back-to-back terraced housing constructed in red brick under a pitched roof of either slate or replacement tiles. Front dormer windows are a common feature.
4. The Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (the SPD) advises that in circumstances where the predominance of existing dormers has changed the appearance of the street sufficiently for dormers to be considered part of the character, new front dormers should be: small, well designed additions which retain the original roof form; constructed of appropriate materials; and reflect the proportions and positions of existing windows.
5. In addition, saved Policies BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds City Council Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) (the UDP) require alterations and extensions to respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building, and be well designed generally. Similarly, Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (amended 2019) (the CS) requires, amongst other things, that new development delivers high-quality design that respects the character and quality of surrounding buildings and contributes positively to place making.
6. The proposed front dormer window could not reasonably be described as small. Rather, it would be a wide and bulky flat roof structure that would extend up flush from both the front and gable walls using matching brick. The profile and roof form of this simple end terrace property would be significantly altered as a result. The harm would be compounded by the materials and window

proportions which would give the development a solid and top heavy appearance overall.

7. Existing dormers in the street vary in size, but the majority of those that the proposal would be seen in immediate context with are much smaller and are generally of a light-weight appearance due to the materials used and their solid to void ratio. As such, their presence should not be seen as validation for the introduction of harmful development at the appeal site. In addition, whilst the property to the rear, 94 Bayswater Road, contains a very similar form of development to that which is proposed, I note that it predates the current relevant local planning policies and guidance. Moreover, it serves to confirm my view that the proposal would be a harmful addition.
8. Thus, even taking account of the existing dormers, I find that the proposal would not be a well-designed and sympathetic addition to the original building and street scene. Any benefits the proposal may bring in terms of improved internal living accommodation would not justify or outweigh the harm that would be caused.
9. I therefore conclude that the development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host building and its immediate surroundings, and so, conflicts with the design requirements of saved Policies BD6 and GP5 of the UDP; Policy P10 of the CS; and the SPD. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) with regards to achieving well designed places.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, the proposed development fails to accord with the relevant policies of the development plan and the Framework. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR