



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2024 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3344553

22 Barden Terrace, Armley, Leeds, LS12 3EG

- 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 Mark Beattie against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01730/FU.
 - The development proposed is a front dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal dwelling is a red brick, two-storey terraced property with a loft conversion via a front dormer to the gable roof. The street consists of similar two storey properties with small modest dormers to the front roof slopes, which creates a consistent character to the area. The dormer extension is existing.
5. The dormer occupies a large portion of the roof space as a result of its depth and particularly its width, resulting in a large, boxy and dominant addition to the front roof slope. This appears as an overbearing extension and adversely alters the existing dwelling's simple character and design. Although the dormer uses appropriate materials and is set down from the ridge by a more limited amount than the dormer replaced, and similarly by a lesser degree in from the sides, the small amount of glazing and surrounding upvc cladding around the glazed element increases its prominence. Furthermore, by virtue of its size and detailed design, the dormer damages the existing quality of the area and the terrace within the street scene, where it is clearly visible from both Barden Terrace and on the approach from Conference Road.
6. I acknowledge that there are various examples of front dormers along the terrace. However, these are generally more modest additions to the roofscape which are small in depth and width and are a form of design reflecting the

subservience of the attic floor of the properties, contrary to the impact of the appeal development.

7. The introduction of the dormer has dominated the relatively shallow roof plane resulting in an unbalancing of the proportions of the host building. This has been further exacerbated by the solid side cheeks which appear cumbersome and incongruous when compared with the more lightweight and smaller dormers elsewhere within the terrace.
8. For the reasons as set out, the dormer has an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. As such it fails to comply with the relevant provisions of Policy P10 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) and the Saved Unitary Development Plan Review (2016) policies GP5 and BD6 which require development to be compatible with the host property and the surrounding area. There would also be conflict with HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, which requires all extensions to respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.

Other Matters

9. I accept that there is already a variety of existing dormer designs within the surrounding area including two large dormers on the opposing side of Barden Terrace. Nonetheless, the design of these do not represent the prevailing character of the area, and I am mindful that each development must be assessed on its own merits. I am therefore satisfied that the references to these developments do not justify development that harms the character and appearance of the area.
10. I have also noted the appellant's submission in relation to the creation of more usable living space in the attic rooms. Whilst I do not doubt that this would be the case, it does not outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The scheme conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole, and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR