



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2025

by N Kempton BAHons PGDip MA IHBC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3353420

63 Sunset Road, Meanwood, Leeds LS6 4LS

- 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 J C Villacruz against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application ref is 24/03849/FU.
 - The development is retrospective planning application for a front dormer, constructed to match the existing building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for retrospective planning application for a front dormer, constructed to match the existing building at 63 Sunset Road, Leeds LS6 4LS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/03849/FU.

Preliminary Matters

2. I've used the description of works from the application form in my formal decision, which differs from the decision notice. I've seen no evidence that amended wording was formally agreed between both parties and on that basis, I have used the appellant's wording.
3. The dormer window was in situ at the time of my site visit, and I have dealt with the appeal on the basis that is a retrospective application to construct a dormer window.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow. It is located within a predominantly residential area of Meanwood. Sunset Road is characterised by a close-knit grain with a regular layout of paired semis, orientated with ridgelines parallel to the street. The massing of the bungalows is stepped, with the break in rooflines reflecting the gradient of the falling land levels.
6. I observed dwellings with an assortment of dormer windows to the front, side and rear, in the vicinity of the appeal site. Incremental additions and alterations, such as rooflights and solar panels, also pepper roof slopes in Sunset Road and surrounding streets. Whilst not prevalent, dormer windows are a common, though incidental, feature in the street scene. Furthermore, the topography and the layout

and orientation of dwellings in neighbouring streets and cul-de-sacs, afford views of dormer windows in the wider roofscape.

7. Evidence before me suggests that some of the comparable dormers, which feature amongst the established pattern of development along Sunset Road, predate current planning policy and guidance. However, the Council concede a notable exception being the dormer window at 45 Sunset Road, which was recently permitted under current planning policy and guidance. The explanation given for this recent comparable decision is noted.
8. In any case, the dormer at the appeal property does not substantially undermine the pattern of development or imbalance the pair, limited as it is to the roof slope. Whilst the host dwelling forms part of a paired semi, it is not a symmetrical pair. Rather the stepped ridgeline and incremental alterations to the roofline, frontage boundary treatment and glazing arrangement to the fenestration, all serve to distinguish the dwellings and undermine any symmetry.
9. I observed that consistency in the street scene is principally derived from the rhythm and layout of the paired semi-detached bungalows, and their relationship to the topography, rather than any symmetry in the form and design of the dwellings. The addition of a dormer window does not erode or detract from the evident consistency in rhythm and layout.
10. The dormer window, which is aligned with the fenestration below, is proportionate and subservient to the host dwelling, the massing and roof form of which remains clearly legible. It is not unduly prominent and does not represent an incongruous addition or departure from the architectural treatment of the paired semi-detached bungalows that predominate in Sunset Road.
11. Therefore, I conclude that the dormer window is not obtrusive and does not have a significant and harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area. As such, it does not conflict with policies P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (2019), and BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds Saved Unitary Development Plan (2006). Among other objectives, these seek to ensure that all development proposals are of high quality, respect context and enhance the quality of the area.
12. The development also complies with the aim of achieving well-designed and beautiful places identified in chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

13. The Council has not suggested any conditions. Given that the appeal relates to retrospective development and the dormer window is already in situ, there is no need for a commencement condition or a condition that sets a timeframe for completion. As such, I do not consider it necessary to apply any conditions.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development is in accordance with the development plan taken as a whole and the appeal is allowed.

N Kempton

INSPECTOR