
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2017

by Philip Lewis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/17/3178936

54 Kedleston Road, Moortown, Leeds LS8 2BJ

- 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 Mr and Mrs Franco Pardini against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/02605/FU, dated 31 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2017.
 - The development proposed was originally described as 'proposed extension to front of dwelling forming larger hall and bedroom over'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey front extension at 54 Kedleston Road, Moortown, Leeds LS8 2BJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/02605/FU, dated 31 March 2017, 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: Drawing Numbers 1427.1 and 1427.2.
 - 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. The description of development was changed to 'two storey front extension' when the planning application was validated by the Council and I have used this description in my decision above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. 54 Kedleston Road is a two storey semi-detached dwelling. I saw at my site visit that there is some uniformity in the appearance of two storey semi-detached dwellings on Kedleston Road, which have prominent two storey bay windows and are constructed of red brick with hipped tiled roofs. However, I also observed the variety in alterations and extensions made to some

properties on the street, which include front and side extensions. Whilst the front elevation of the appeal property appears little altered, the attached dwelling appears significantly altered to the side and front. Consequently, the pair of dwellings appears unbalanced.

5. The appeal proposal is for a two storey front extension with a low hipped roof. The proposed extension would be narrow in width and whilst it would project out beyond the bay window, I do not consider it would appear out of scale with the host dwelling in terms of its size, scale or massing. Although it would be sited close to the bay window, I do not consider that the proposed extension would appear either discordant or unattractive in the street scene. In addition, given that the attached dwelling has a two storey front extension adjacent to its two storey bay window, I do not consider that the appeal scheme would appear discordant with the attached dwelling.
6. I have had regard to the comment that the existing two storey front extensions in the street predate the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document April 2012 (SPD). Nevertheless, I saw during my site visit a number of such extensions in the area which contribute to its character and appearance.
7. The appeal proposal would not have an unacceptable effect upon the character and appearance of the area and does not conflict with Leeds Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policy P10 which is concerned with design and includes amongst other things that new development provides good design that is appropriate to its location, scale and function. The appeal scheme also does not conflict with Leeds Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP) saved Policy GP5 which is concerned with development proposals resolving detailed planning considerations or saved UDP Policy BD6 which states that all alterations and extensions should respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building.
8. I also find that the appeal proposal does not conflict with HDG1 of the SPD which includes amongst other things that all extensions, additions and alterations should respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality. Additionally, the proposal does not conflict with the design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

9. I have imposed conditions regarding timescale and specifying the approved plans as that provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition regarding external construction materials in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Lewis

INSPECTOR