



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 May 2024

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3338099

19 Sissons View, Middleton, Leeds LS10 4LJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) 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 is 23/05212/FU.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of loft including 2no. dormer windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a hipped roof semi-detached property, which has been extended to the side at single storey. It is set at an angle and located close to the junction with Sissons Terrace. Whilst there are variations to property types within the area the overall context is predominantly characterised by relatively close-knit hipped roof semi-detached and terraced dwellings that share a number of similar features, particularly the unaltered hipped roof. The regular appearance contributes to a significant degree of uniformity in the area.
4. Although the proposed side dormer window would be set up from the eaves, it would not be set in from the side of the hipped roof and would extend from the ridge of the host dwelling. The length of the ridge of the roof along the main axis facing the corner towards Sissons Terrace would be increased and would be longer than those properties which share the same hipped roof uniformity. It would thus appear as an incongruous roof form and the development would interrupt the existing symmetry of the appeal property as a hipped roof semi-detached pair.
5. Although there is an existing single storey side extension, which does increase the prominence of the host dwelling, this does not justify increasing the prominence further. On its own, the rear dormer window would be a modest addition and would not be as prominent. However, although it would be seen in glimpsed views, there would be additional bulk when seen together with the side dormer, particularly when trees are not in leaf. However, the side dormer on its own would be highly visible from wider public vantage points due to the

location of the appeal dwelling facing the corner towards the junction, and the side roof plane being angled towards Sissons View.

6. Whilst I note the variety in dwelling types on Sissons Terrace, Sissons View and Laurel Place, their features appear to be part of the original design of these properties, rather than later additions. Therefore, whilst I accept that there are other roof forms in the area, the introduction of a side dormer window would be inconsistent with the character and appearance of predominantly unaltered hipped roof features of the more simply formed and prolific house type of the semi-detached pairs and terraces within the surrounding streets. Overall I conclude that the proposed development would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
7. There would be conflict with the requirements of 'Saved' Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) and Policy P10 of the Core Strategy Select Review (2019). Together, these seek to ensure that development proposals resolve detailed planning considerations and that development should provide good design and should respect the scale, form, detailing of the original building. There would also be conflict with the provisions of the chapter 12 Framework where it seeks to ensure developments are sympathetic to local character and maintain a strong sense of place. For similar reasons, the proposal would not fulfil the aims of HDG1 of the Leeds Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (April 2012).

Other Matters

8. The proposed development would utilise suitable materials. There are no other planning concerns including the effect on neighbouring living conditions. Whilst important, these are neutral matters in the overall planning balance.

Conclusion

9. There are no other material considerations to suggest that the decision in this case should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR