
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2017

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/17/3180287

45 Kingswood Gardens, Moor Allerton, Leeds, LS8 2BH

- 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 Ms Ravinder Summan against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/01528, dated 8 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is a double storey extension to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The dwelling is one of a pair of semi-detached houses. The area is characterised by similar properties and whilst many houses have been extended, the majority of the pairs are fairly symmetrical at the front with bay windows being the dominant feature. This cohesive style provides a strong element of uniformity to the street-scene.
4. I appreciate that the two-storey extension would be constructed from matching materials and that the new first floor window would line up with the existing one. However, the extension would be about a third the width of the front of the property and would stand very close to the two storey bay. As a result, it would visually dominate and unbalance the pair of semi-detached houses and further add to the imbalance already created by the existing large dormer extension. The resultant dwelling would look unattractive and incongruous within the street-scene.
5. I saw at my visit that there are several properties in the surrounding area that have similar extensions but my observations of these allowed me to see the visual harm that they have created. Allowing an additional similar extension would create further harm. I note the appellant's comments that these extensions have planning permission but I am not bound by previous decisions of the Council. I also note that there are two letters of support but these are not determinative of my decision.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, I find conflict with Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan and Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy which, in combination, seek to ensure that development respects the character and appearance of the area with regard to materials, scale, design, and layout. It would also conflict with Policy HDG1 of the Leeds Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document which has similar objectives. I also find conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which promotes good design.
7. For the above reasons I dismiss the appeal.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR