
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2024

by **Andrew McCormack BSc (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3340344

77 St. Anne's Road, Headingley, Leeds LS6 3NZ

- 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 Mrs Sau Chan against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 24/00328/FU, dated 15 January 2024, was refused by notice dated 8 March 2024.
 - The development proposed is part two storey and part single storey side and rear extension and new dormer window to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal proposal is an amended scheme following an approval for planning permission in 2023 for a part two storey and part single storey side and rear extension to the host property. The amendment in relation to this appeal involves the addition of a dormer extension to the front by extending up from the projecting first floor bay window into the roof space. For clarification and given the approval granted previously for the rear and side extensions contained within this appeal scheme, I have considered only the proposed window dormer extension to the front of the host property in my assessment and determination of this appeal.
3. I have had regard to other examples of proposed schemes and appeal cases referred to me by the appellant in their submissions. However, I must consider the proposal that is before me on its own merits and circumstances and also in the context of the evidence before me and confirm that I have done so. As such, these other schemes and cases have limited weight in my overall determination of the appeal.
4. References made to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in this decision relate to the latest version of the Framework published on 19 December 2023.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this appeal is therefore the effect of the proposed front dormer window extension, on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. This appeal relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwelling built of painted render with a tiled roof. The appeal property is in an established residential area containing a number of similar properties of a similar age with some variations in design. The frontages of the predominantly semi-detached properties in the area, and particularly along St Annes Road, are broadly consistent in appearance with a small range a variance in styles present. There is just one nearby property, 87 St Anne's Road (No.87), which has a front dormer window extension.

7. The Framework (paragraph 131) sets out that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps to make development acceptable. The Framework goes on to state that development that is not well designed should be refused (paragraph 139).
8. Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy 2014 deals with design and sets out that alterations to existing properties should be based on a thorough contextual analysis and provide good design that is appropriate to its location, scale and function. Policy BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Review 2006 says that all alterations and extensions should respect the form and dealing of the original building. This advice is expanded upon in the Council's Householder Design Guide (the Design Guide) which seeks to assist people wishing to alter or extend their property and to provide advice on how to design sympathetic extensions which respect their surroundings and the character and appearance of the area.
9. In relation to the visual impact of the proposed front dormer window extension, it is evident to me that it does not comply with the aims and intentions of both relevant local and national policies. Due to its location, scale and design, I find that the proposed dormer window extension would form a dominant and incongruous feature that would be harmful to the character and appearance of not only the host property but also the pair of semi-detached dwellings within which it would be situated. Moreover, due to its exceptional design in the local area, the front dormer extension would be an element that would be predominant and out of keeping with the prevailing character and appearance of the wider streetscene.
10. A significant element of the character of the host property relates to the simple and largely unaltered appearance of its front elevation. In my view, the proposed dormer window extension would substantially and detrimentally intrude on the simple slope of the roof, introducing a development that would be significantly at odds with the property's overall character. It would introduce a dominant, incongruous and bulky feature that would unbalance the proportions of the host property and its semi-detached pair, substantially altering their cumulative character and appearance as a pair. As such, I find the proposed dormer window extension would not be a discrete or sympathetic addition. Rather, it would be a feature that would dominate the roof slope and front elevation of the property and make it appear top heavy.
11. The dominance and harm that would be created by the dormer window extension would be further exacerbated by the fact that the form and proportions of the proposed window would have no regard to the scale and form of the property. The appellant has referred to the presence of a similar structure at No.87. This is a similar structure to that proposed but on a slightly different styled property and, as I note, is the only such extension in the surrounding streetscape visible when at the appeal property. Furthermore, the development at No.87 is historic and has no planning history. The Council has made the point that such circumstances serve to demonstrate why the proposed dormer window would have a significantly adverse impact on its surrounding. I agree with this view and therefore find that the presence of the dormer at No.87 cannot be used to justify further development.
12. As a result, the proposed dormer window extension would, by reason of its scale and design, result in a visually dominant and incongruous feature that would fail to respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the pair of dwellings to which it forms a part. For these reasons, it would therefore also be harmful to the character and appearance of the wider area where a broadly consistent and uniform frontage appearance to properties in the local area with no dormer window extensions predominates.
13. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed dormer window extension would have a significant harmful effect the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Therefore, it would be contrary to Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy 2014, Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds UDP Review 2006 and Policy HDG1 of the Design

Guide and the guidance within it. Furthermore, the proposed dormer window extension would be contrary to the relevant policy and guidance set out within the Framework.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A McCormack

Inspector