



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2025

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3371176

16 Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge, Leeds LS16 7HR

- 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 Kelvin Alleyne against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application reference is 25/03531/FU.
 - The development proposed is a dormer to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a linked pair of dormers to the front elevation of this property. The dwelling has already been extended with the hipped roof having been replaced by a gable. The form of the proposed front roof addition would include two pitched roof dormers linked by a flat roof element to provide a larger scale of raised internal roof height. It would dominate the front roof slope as a result of its overall size. Whilst the property has rear roof additions, these are not publicly visible. This is not an area where front dormers are a characteristic of the street scene. This structure would detract from the existing character of the area and the form of the structure would represent poor design.
4. Front dormers are considered specifically in the Leeds Householder Design Guide (2012) which advises that dormer windows to the front will not normally be considered acceptable, particularly in prominent locations, on unbroken roof slopes or where traditional dormers are being replaced by box-style structures. It advises that two small well designed dormer windows are generally considered to be more sympathetic than one large dormer window. However, this proposal is not replacing an existing dormer and the conjoining of the two elements would result in a large addition that would be contrary to the expectations of the guidance.
5. Reference has been made to other front dormers in the area. The example at 28 Mosely Wood Avenue appears to be a historic addition and it is not evident that it was approved by the council. The houses at Moseley Beck Lane are relatively new and appear to have been designed with front dormers although these are separate features not joined by the flat roof element now proposed. They therefore make up

the character of that new area of development. There is no evidence that the council has been inconsistent in its approach and the examples put forward do not suggest that this proposal should be approved.

6. In conclusion, the proposal would detract from the existing character and appearance of this area and would represent poor design. It would be contrary to the design expectations of policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019); and policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review - 2006). It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which is clear that development that is not well designed should be refused.
7. I have had regard to the information provided by the appellant and accept that the works would result in improved accommodation and further investment. However, these matters do not outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR