
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2024

by T Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3329422

18 Sunnybank, Micklefield, Leeds LS25 4DQ

- 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 Best against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/02859/FU, dated 5 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is Dormer 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. At the time of my site visit, a dormer window that broadly accorded with that before me under this appeal was present on the front roof slope.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area with regard to the dormer window.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a long established traditional dwelling located on Sunnybank. The substantial terrace within which the appeal property sits has largely unbroken front roof slopes other than for inclusion of rooflights which sit at low profile following the existing roof pitch of the terrace.
5. There is what the evidence indicates to be a front dormer window of some age at No.1 Sunnybank. There is also another more modern front dormer window at No.12 which is the subject of appeal APP/N4720/D/23/3329427.
6. The front dormer window has a prominent appearance from within the street. I note the set down from the ridgeline, the stepped nature of the terrace ridgelines and the prominent chimney stacks.
7. However, the limited set back from the eaves combined with the significant width and height of the dormer window results in the dormer window having a bulky and domineering appearance and effectively visually giving the appearance of a further storey on the property.

8. In this sense, the resultant appearance of the property is significantly out of character with the majority of those in the terrace where by and large, interventions within the front roof slopes are limited to rooflights.
9. The limited alignment of the windows on the dormer to those on the dwelling results in limited harm given the arrangement on the front elevation of the dwelling is not uniform. The dark UPVC boarding materials do not cause significant harm given that material is commonly used within windows on the street.
10. However, the front dormer window would have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area for the reasons outlined above. 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.
11. 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.

Other Matters

12. I note the presence of the existing established dormer window at No.1. However, this dormer window appears to be of some age and is likely to pre-date the current policy of the Council.
13. It is located at the end of the terrace and is a broadly isolated feature within the street scene. I also note that there are differing finishes to the properties throughout the terrace, however this does not justify the proposal before me. I 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.