
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2025 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by C Butcher BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3368198

19 Ash Hill Gardens, Shadwell, Leeds LS17 8JW

- 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 Lidster against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01168/FU.
 - The development is replacement dormer window to 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.

Preliminary Matter

3. I observed on my site visit that the development has been completed in accordance with the submitted plans. The appeal has therefore been determined on the basis that retrospective permission is sought for the development which has already been implemented.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a side-gabled one and a half storey detached dwelling located within a well-established suburban neighbourhood. I observed during my visit that the appeal property is an example of a recurrent house type within the road, and that a key original design feature of these dwellings is a shallow front dormer window of consistent positioning, size and general appearance. Although the streetscene includes a variety of other house types, the widespread retention of these roof projections in their original form unifies the many dormer bungalows, in doing so positively contributing to the area's character.
6. A replacement front dormer window has been constructed as part of a recent scheme of works to alter and extend the appeal property. Cumulatively, these works have produced a dwelling of significantly different appearance from other

surrounding houses of the same design, with the new dormer emphasising this conspicuous individuality.

7. The new dormer is still set in from the edges of the roof, but owing to a marked increase in its depth, height and width, it is of a considerably greater volume than the original dormer. As a result, it now appears as a substantial projecting mass from the house's front roof slope, at odds with the uniformity of the modestly proportioned original front dormers within the locality on this house type. Its incompatibility with the established streetscene is emphasised by virtue of its siting next to the two original dormers on adjacent properties, where its larger dimensions and low, off-centre position stands in contrast to their far smaller scale and central placement.
8. The development's incongruous bulk and positioning are further accentuated by its extensive slimline vertical timber cladding. The low-profile front dormers on the one and a half storey houses within the road consistently feature a band of horizontal cladding or tile hanging between their windows. Because the replacement dormer however rises much higher than these original volumes, its cladding envelops the window surrounds, stretching from eaves to roof slope, in doing so contributing to an overall form that does not respect its context. Although this cladding matches with the house's new aesthetic, its stark departure from the road's traditional palette of materials only accentuates the development's jarring appearance.
9. I noted that other front dormer window designs are present within Ash Hill Gardens, including at nearby Nos 20 and 25. However, these features are found on fundamentally different two storey house types, and therefore their presence does not justify the unsympathetic development at the appeal property. Furthermore, the dormer at No 25 is noticeably set much further in on one side than the appeal scheme before me, and therefore the two are clearly not directly comparable. While there may be further examples in the wider area, it is clear that No 19 is primarily seen within the context of the original style dormers in the immediate vicinity.
10. On this basis, the replacement dormer window has a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. The development conflicts with Policies GP5 and BD6 of Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006, Policy P10 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 (as amended 2019) and Policies GEN1 and HLC3 of the Shadwell Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2033. Taken together, these policies explain that all extensions and alterations should respect the scale and form of the original building, whilst being of a high quality design that is appropriate to its context, including the character of surrounding buildings and through having regard for local distinctiveness. Furthermore, the development fails to comply with Principle HDG1 of the Leeds Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012, which provides that extensions and alterations should respect the form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality, paying particular attention to roof form.

Other Matters

11. The appellant's evidence details that the replacement dormer's enlarged size was brought about by technical considerations arising during the construction of the previously consented scheme, namely the identified poor condition of the original structure leading to the installation of a new support beam for a replacement dormer, and enhanced insulation in connection with a new air source pump heating

system. However, I have little evidence before me to suggest that the development as constructed was the only solution to address any relevant regulations. Consequently, and whilst I attribute the increased thermal efficiency of the dwelling limited positive weight, this does not outweigh the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the property and locality.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Morrison

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.

C Butcher

INSPECTOR