



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2024 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3349427

56 Walmsley Road, Leeds, West Yorkshire, LS6 1NG

- 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 A Shah against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01961/FU.
 - The development is described as a dormer to the front.
-

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 development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling of brick and render construction with a gable roof. It is located on Walmsley Road, a residential street mainly characterised by other two storey semi-detached dwellings. I observed that some of the other properties have also converted lofts with rooflights or dormer roof extensions visible.
5. The dormer occupies a large portion of the roof space due to 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 up from the eaves by a more limited amount, the small amount of glazing and surrounding upvc cladding around the glazed element increases its prominence.
6. 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 as an awkward and incongruous design feature.
7. In reaching my conclusions, I have also had regard to the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (the

'SPD'). The SPD states that dormer windows to the front will not normally be considered acceptable, particularly in prominent locations. There is a caveat stating that in some streets the overwhelming predominance of existing dormer windows has changed the appearance of a street sufficiently for dormer windows to be considered part of the character. In such circumstances dormer windows to the front should be small and well-designed additions which retain the original roof form and are constructed of appropriate materials and reflect the proportions and positions of existing windows.

8. I observed on my site visit that there were some other dormers present within the wider street scene. However, the presence of the existing dormer windows does not represent a defining characteristic of the area with most of the front roof slopes remaining unaltered. It was also apparent that the existing dormer windows would not have met the design requirements of the current SPD.
9. In acknowledging that there are other box style dormers to the front of properties on Walmsley Road. I am mindful that each proposal must be considered on its own merits against current local planning policy and guidance. In this context, the front dormer at 56 Walmsley Road would conflict with current guidance set out in the SPD. The current scheme contributes to a cumulative adverse visual impact when assessed in conjunction with the existing box dormers dominating the simple roof forms, with the existence of similar development not justifying further development of this type.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to the saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (2019). The scheme would also fail to accord with the guidance set out within the SPD. These policies and guidance seek to ensure that alterations are of an appropriate scale and design having regard to the existing building and the wider context. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that development is well-designed and sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. 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

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR