



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2023

by M Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3317351

22 Woodview Terrace, Beeston, Leeds, West Yorkshire LS11 6LF

- 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 Richard Willis against the decision of Leeds City Council.
- The application Ref 22/07672/FU, dated 3 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2022.
- The development proposed is dormer window to front.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for dormer window to front at 22 Woodview Terrace, Beeston, Leeds, West Yorkshire LS11 6LF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/07672/FU, dated 3 November 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan and Proposed Floor Plan, Elevations and Section.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached back-to-back dwelling of brick construction with a pitched slate roof. It is located on the eastern side of Woodview Terrace which is mainly characterised by terraced houses. Their position at the back edge of the pavement creates a close knit street scene. Some have converted lofts with rooflights and dormers. The Masjid Ibraheem Mosque is on the same side of the street and is a dominant building locally.
4. The proposed dormer would be set back slightly from the eaves and well below the ridge. Whilst it would be relatively wide, the dormer would nevertheless maintain reasonably large gaps from both sides of the roof. Therefore, despite the width of the dormer, a significant proportion of the main roof would still be legible. Accordingly, I consider the proposal to be well proportioned, it would sit comfortably on the roof and not appear as a dominant addition to the roof.

5. The Council says that the immediate street scene is characterised by properties with untouched, clutter free roofs. However, during my site visit I noted that an front dormer had been constructed at 28 Woodview Terrace¹. That property is a few doors away on the same side of the street as the site. Whilst the proposed dormer would have a slightly greater width and height than the dormer at No 28, it would not appear significantly different in terms of its position on the roof, or its overall size and design, particularly when viewed from street level.
6. There are many other front dormers to properties on surrounding streets of a similar size and design to the appeal proposal and in some cases larger. There are also dormers on the other side of Woodview Terrace, albeit these differ to the size and design of the appeal proposal and may be original features. The proposal would be seen in the context of the dormer at No 28 and would not have a markedly different impact to this in terms of its effect on the roofscape. In these circumstances, I am satisfied that the dormer would sit comfortably within the street scene.
7. I have been referred to an appeal decision for a front dormer at 13 Woodview Terrace². However, that appeal related to a property in a different part of the street on the other side of its junction with Woodview Road. The precise details of that development are not before me and so I cannot be sure it represents a direct parallel to the appeal proposal, particularly with regards to size, design and form. Moreover, that decision was made prior to the approval of the dormer at No 28. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. It would comply with saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006), Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (2019), and Policy HDG1 of the Leeds City Council Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012). Amongst other things, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that alterations are of an appropriate scale and design to the existing building and the wider context. The proposal would also accord with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that development is well-designed and sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard implementation condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, it is necessary to include a condition that the external materials of the dormer match the existing building.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, and subject to the conditions specified, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR

¹ Council ref 21/03429/FU

² Appeal ref APP/N4720/D/21/3267227