



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2025

by J D Westbrook BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3365577

27 Low Bank Street, Farsley, LS28 5JJ

- 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 James Tamlyn-Groombridge against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00051/FU
 - The development proposed is the construction of a dormer roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The dormer roof extension is in place and the application is, therefore, of a retrospective nature.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the dormer roof extension on the character and appearance of the Farsley Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. No 27 is a mid-terraced house situated on the south side of Low Bank Street, and within the Farsley Conservation Area (CA). The street slopes down from west to east and the houses are set down the slope in pairs or small groups. The appeal property is apparently a back-to-back dwelling of stone construction with a pitched roof, and is fronted by a small garden. The property at the rear fronts onto Gladstone Street. The proposed dormer roof extension is in place and is set back a little from the eaves. It has a flat roof level with the roof ridge and extends across almost the whole of the roof plane. The sides and front of the dormer are of grey plastic and there is a large horizontal window in the front elevation.
5. Policy P10 of the Council's Core Strategy (CS) indicates that proposals will be supported where they accord with certain key principles, including that the size, scale, and design is appropriate to its context and respects the character and quality of surrounding buildings; that it protects and enhances the district's existing historic assets; and that it protects the visual amenity of the area through high quality design. Policy P11 of the CS indicates that the historic environment, including locally significant undesignated assets and their settings, will be conserved and enhanced.

6. Policy BD6 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan Review (UDPR) states that all alterations and extensions should respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building. Policy N19 of the UDPR indicates that all extensions within conservation areas should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area by ensuring that detailed design of buildings, including the roofscape, is such that the proportions of the parts relate to each other and to adjoining buildings.
7. Policy HDG1 of the Council's Householder Design Guide (HDG) states that all extensions, additions and alterations should respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality, with particular attention being paid to the roof form and roof line. Guidance on dormers in the HDG includes that they should be small discrete additions which retain the character of the original roof; that they should be constructed of materials that match those of the existing roof; and that they should not be of a size and scale which dominates the existing roof. In addition, dormers to the front will not normally be acceptable, particularly in prominent locations or on unbroken roof slopes.
8. In this case, No 27 appears as a narrow fronted, mid terraced house, where the terrace is characterised by a sandstone construction with slate roofs and chimney stacks between properties. The terrace as a whole is a prominent feature with a high degree of coherence in its design and materials. It is complemented by the properties on High Bank Street to the north, from which it is separated by a grassed area that allows clear and open views of both sets of terraces.
9. The CA character appraisal for the Low Bank Street area notes the positive characteristics as including the coursed sandstone and Welsh roof slate that are the predominant building materials, and that roofs are articulated by chimney stacks and pots. Ways of maintaining that character include retention of slate roofs and chimneys.
10. The dormer roof extension at No 27 effectively covers the whole of the front-facing roof slope, dominating the roofscape of the terrace and of a size and scale harmful to the character and appearance of the host property itself. It creates a top-heavy appearance to the property, out of proportion to the main dwelling. In addition, it has been constructed of unsympathetic materials and a design that is out of context with the general locality. Finally, it appears to have been built around the chimney stack, such that the chimney is effectively lost as a key feature of the roofline of the terrace.
11. The appellant makes note of a number of examples of large dormer roof extensions in the vicinity, including a similar box dormer at the nearby No 33. However, it would appear that this nearby example may not have received express permission and, in addition, pre-dates the HDG. In any event, I consider that this example is harmful to the character and appearance of the area and should not be repeated. Other examples along the southern frontage of Low Bank Street include smaller, gable-fronted dormers at Nos 1, 3 and 9 which are more sympathetic in terms of scale and design and do not upset the rhythm of the roofscape and roofline along this side of the road.
12. The appellant also notes examples of large dormers to the rear of the terrace at the north-western end of the road, and a dormer on the rear elevation of No 42 Red Lane. I have no details of the Low Bank Street examples, although they are not

prominent in the street scene and are not on front-facing roof slopes. The example at Red Lane was allowed on appeal, but once again this is on an elevation that does not front the road, and has been accepted as meeting the criteria for permitted development in Part One, Schedule 2 and Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. This situation does not apply in the current case.

13. I accept that the dormer roof extension provides additional living accommodation for the property. However, this does not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of this part of the CA. Most other properties in the terrace do not have any front-facing dormers, and those that exist at the eastern end of the street are generally smaller and more sympathetic to the context of Low Bank Street and its immediate surroundings.

Other Matter

14. The appellant has indicated a willingness to amend the external materials used in the dormer roof extension. However, this would not affect the main issues of scale and over-dominant appearance of the extension.

Conclusion

15. The dormer roof extension, by reason of its scale, design, materials and over-dominant appearance in the context of the host property and the wider locality, is harmful to the character and appearance of the CA. It conflicts with Policies P10 and P11 of the CS, Policies BD6 and N19 of the UDPR, and with guidance on design, including design of dormers, in the HDG. Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR