
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/23/3329427

12 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 23/02858/FU, dated 5 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is Dormer to front. Dormer to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

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, dormer windows that broadly accorded with those before me under this appeal were present on the front and rear roof slopes.
3. The Council have not raised concern with regard to the rear dormer window. I have no reason to disagree. I have considered the prospect of a split decision but cannot be sure that the front and rear dormers are clearly severable both physically and functionally.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. 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 are low profile following the existing roof pitch of the terrace.
 6. 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.18 which is the subject of appeal APP/N4720/D/23/3329422.
 7. The front dormer window has a prominent appearance from within the street as well as some visibility from West View and the forecourt area adjacent to Micklefield Railway Station.
-

8. It has a set down from the ridgeline. However, the limited set back from the eaves, combined with the significant width and height of the dormer window results in it having a bulky and domineering appearance, effectively visually giving the appearance of a further storey on the property.
9. 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.
10. The limited alignment of the windows on the dormer to those windows on the dwelling results in limited harm given that the arrangement on the front elevation of the dwelling is not uniform. The dark UPVC boarding materials would not cause significant harm given that material is commonly used within windows on the street.
11. However, the front dormer window would have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area for the reasons identified 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 SPD^[1].
12. 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

13. I note the presence of the existing established front dormer window at No.1. However, this appears to be of some age and is likely to pre-date the current policy of the Council. It is set 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.