

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2016

by C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 25th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/16/3158283

17 Belvedere Court, Alwoodley, Leeds LS17 8NF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Roopa Setty against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/03050/FU, dated 9 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 June 2016.
 - The development proposed was originally described as 'proposed loft conversion with hip to gable and rear dormer extension (revised scheme).'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for gable extensions to both sides, raised ridge height and dormer window to rear at 17 Belvedere Court, Alwoodley, Leeds LS17 8NF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/03050/FU, dated 9 May 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing and Proposed Plans ART 16-009.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out in the banner heading above, which is taken from the application form, it is evident from the submitted plans that the proposed development relates to extensions to both sides of the existing hipped roof to form gables and an increase in the ridge height, together with a dormer window to the rear.
 3. The Council's decision notice describes the proposed development as 'Gable extensions to both sides, raised ridge height and dormer window to rear'. This revised description of development more appropriately describes the appeal proposal, and I have therefore considered the appeal on that basis since neither of the parties would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me taking this course of action.
-

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal property is a 2 storey detached house with a hipped roof located at the eastern end of a residential cul-de-sac.
6. An extant planning permission (Ref. 15/03739/FU) for gable roof extensions to both sides of the appeal property established the principle of altering the roof form. The houses in Belvedere Court feature a variety of hipped and gable ended main roofs. I note that the Council raise no objection to the proposed gable extensions, concluding in the delegation report that this element of the appeal proposal would not harm the character of the area. Given the variety of roof forms in the street, I agree with the Council's assessment in this regard.
7. Due to the mixture of house types, roof forms and pitches within the street, there is little consistency in terms of ridge heights. The appeal proposal would raise the height of the ridge by around half a metre. In the context of the varied built form within Belvedere Court, such a modest increase in the overall height of the appeal property would not appear incongruous.
8. A hipped roof dormer window is proposed within the rear roof slope. This would be visible from the street as well as from neighbouring houses and gardens. Dormer windows and rear roof extensions are not a common feature of development in the vicinity of the appeal site. However, many houses have projecting 2 storey elements at the front with a mixture of hip and gable roofs and some properties feature small gables directly above the eaves. Because of this variety in the overall roofscape, the proposed dormer would not appear out of place.
9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development therefore accords with the design aims of Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy and Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan, with design guidance contained in the Leeds Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, and with the core planning principles and policy aims in respect of design set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other matters

10. Occupants of neighbouring properties have also raised concerns regarding the effect of the appeal proposal upon their living conditions, with particular regard to loss of light, outlook and privacy. Given the siting and orientation of the appeal property in relation to surrounding houses, and the modest scale of the proposed development, I do not consider that the appeal proposal would result in a loss of light to or outlook from neighbouring properties. There is adequate spacing between the appeal property and houses to the rear and views from the proposed development towards houses to the north and south of the appeal site would be very oblique, thereby ensuring that there would be no harm arising from overlooking or loss of privacy.

Conditions

11. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawing as this provides certainty. In order to ensure the suitable appearance of the development, I have imposed a condition relating to materials.

Conclusion

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

C L Humphrey

INSPECTOR