



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/22/3307146

16 Mayo Close, Roundhay, Leeds LS8 2PX

- 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 N Sibson against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03106/FU, dated 29 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dormer window on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area, with due regard to the Roundhay Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Roundhay Conservation Area (RCA) is extensive and contains a number of character areas which unify the area and give it a distinctive identity as a suburb built around a large late Georgian park. The appeal site is located within the Oakwood character area, which comprises of a variety of individual estates of houses that fill in the network of original roads with an established suburban character. Mayo Close is a pleasant cul-de-sac development of similarly designed modern detached houses which typifies this character and contributes neutrally to the significance of the RCA as a whole.
4. In determining this appeal, I have a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the RCA. This duty is reflected in Policy P11 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (amended 2019) (the CS), and saved Policy N19 of the Leeds City Council Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) (the UDP). In addition, Policies P10 of the CS, and Policies BD6 and GP5 of the UDP generally seek to ensure that development is of good design which respects the form, proportions and character of the original building and the surrounding area.
5. The Council also refers to its 'Householder Design Guide' Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (the SPD), which advises that dormers should be designed to remain subordinate to the main property by not being of a size and scale which dominates the existing roof; and maintains and respects the features of the existing house.

6. Although the proposed dormer would be set in from the edges of the roof, it would still be a substantial structure occupying the majority of the side roof slope. Its size and box-like form would appear excessively large and out of keeping with the existing building. As a result, the dormer would be an unacceptably dominant addition which would detract significantly from the original form and design of the host property. In doing so it would also cause harm to the character and appearance of the RCA of which it is a part.
7. I recognise that the full expanse of the dormer would not be readily visible from the street and the wider area beyond Mayo Close. However, the requirement for development proposals to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the RCA applies with equal force irrespective of whether the proposal is prominent or in wider public view. I have also noted the presence of some existing dormers in Elmete Drive, but they appear to be original to the design of those particular house types and are not comparable to the appeal scheme in size, so they have little bearing on my assessment.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed dormer window would have an adverse visual effect on the host building and its immediate surroundings, and as a consequence, would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the RCA as a whole. Whilst the harm to the RCA would be classed as less than substantial, this is nevertheless a matter of considerable importance and weight. Given the nature of the proposal, there are no public benefits which would outweigh that harm. Thus, the proposal conflicts with the design and heritage requirements of Policies P10 and P11 of the CS, saved Policies N19, BD6 and GP5 of the UDP, as well as the SPD. 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

9. 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