
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2023

by T Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3325787

6 Eggleston Street, Rodley, Leeds LS13 1JR

- 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 Gabrielle Beaumont against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/02576/FU, dated 26 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is dormer window to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has changed from the application form to the decision notice. That on the application form is sufficient to describe the proposal although I acknowledge that a small rooflight is also proposed as part of the scheme.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a long established traditional terraced back-to-back dwelling located on the north-western side of Eggleston Street. The short terrace within which the appeal property sits along with the next short terrace immediately up the street have largely unbroken roof slopes and do not incorporate dormer windows.
5. This lack of, in particular, flat roofed / box style dormers enables the long established and traditional form and proportions of those dwellings to be appreciated from this end of the street as well as the much busier A657 which passes closely to the north-west. That appearance contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
6. Whilst the dormer window would be set in from the sides of the dwelling and up from the eaves, it would still occupy a substantial part of the roof slope, would only be minimally set down from the ridgeline and therefore would dominate the existing roof slope.

7. The flat roof design would also be at odds with the pitched roof design of the dwelling and its central placement would fail to reflect the positions of the existing aligned windows on the elevation.
8. The dormer window would therefore have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would subsequently fail to accord with policies P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (2019), saved policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) and Policy HDG1 of the SPD¹.
9. Amongst other things, these policies require proposals of good design that are appropriate to their context and which respect the character and quality of surrounding buildings that make up the public realm and wider locality and respect the character and appearance of the locality. Alterations and extensions should respect the scale, form and detailing of the original building.
10. There would also be conflict with SPD guidance which amongst other things advises that dormer windows to the front will not normally be considered acceptable, amongst other locations, on unbroken roof slopes. Front dormer windows must also be small and well designed additions as well as reflecting the proportions and positions of existing windows.

Other Matters

11. I am aware that there is a wide variety of existing dormer windows both within this street and in the surrounding streets which incorporate dwellings of a similar design. However, many of these dormers appear to be of some age and may pre-date current guidance.
12. Many are grouped together such that dormer windows have become an established part of the terrace in which they are situated. SPD guidance does offer some degree of acceptance to well-designed front dormer windows in such instances, although as previously described, that is not the case here with regard to the existing largely undeveloped roof slope of the terrace within which the appeal property sits.
13. There is limited information before me on suggested recently passed planning applications for dormer windows and I therefore afford these matters limited weight.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

14. There is nothing to indicate that the decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

T Burnham

INSPECTOR

¹ Leeds City Council – Householder Design Guide – Supplementary Planning Document – April 2012.