



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2023

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3321723

98 High Street, Yeadon, Leeds LS19 7AB

- 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 Andrew Tesseyman against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01081/FU, dated 17 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is dormer window to the rear; roof lights to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council did not object to the front rooflights and I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, the main issue in this appeal is whether the rear dormer window would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Yeadon Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within the Yeadon Conservation Area (the YCA). The YCA 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 defines much of the historic townscape. The stone and slate-roofed terraced building containing the appeal property is typical of this character, and as such contributes positively to the character and appearance of the YCA and its significance as a designated heritage asset.
4. Although the rear dormer would be set in from the edges of the roof, it would be a wide and bulky structure that would subsume the majority of the rear roof slope of the appeal property. Its excessive size, box-like form, and fenestration design would not reflect the form, proportions, and fenestration of the host building. This would be the case even if appropriate cladding materials were used. Moreover, it would be clearly visible from Windmill Lane and would adversely disrupt the otherwise uniform roofscape along the rear elevation of this terraced block. Consequently, the dormer would not be a well-designed and sympathetic addition to the host building and street scene.
5. I have taken into account that there are other rear dormers in the area, including at 92 and 94 High Street. However, they do not contribute positively to the character of the street scene and significance of the YCA as a whole. It would also appear from the Council's officer report that some do not have a planning record. As such, their presence should not be seen as validation for

further harmful development that would cumulatively erode the character and significance of the YCA over time.

6. Overall, the rear dormer would have an adverse visual effect on the terraced building and its immediate surroundings, and consequently would harm the significance of the YCA. The magnitude of this harm would be modest and can therefore be classed as less than substantial in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Nevertheless, in the context of the YCA as a whole, it would fail to preserve or enhance its character and appearance. This is a matter of considerable importance and weight. Any benefits the proposal may bring in terms of improved internal living accommodation would not come close to outweighing the harm to the significance of the YCA.
7. Accordingly, I conclude that the development would not preserve the character and appearance of the YCA. Thus, the proposal fails to satisfy the statutory requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and parts 12 and 16 of the Framework with regards to achieving good design and conserving and enhancing the historic environment. It would also conflict with the design and heritage requirements of Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (amended 2019), saved Policies GP5, BD6 and N19 of the Leeds City Council Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006), and Policy HDG1 of the Council's 'Householder Design Guide' Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, 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