
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2019

by Alexander Walker MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/19/3232521

12 Kingswood Avenue, Moor Allerton, Leeds LS8 2DB

- 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 Jo Ramdas-Harsia against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02461/FU, dated 17 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of roof space to single dwelling to bedroom and addition of dormer window to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of roof space to single dwelling to bedroom and addition of dormer window to rear at 12 Kingswood Avenue, Moor Allerton, Leeds LS8 2DB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/02461/FU, dated 17 April 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) No development shall commence until details/samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: OS Plan; Proposed Plan; Proposed Front Elevation; Proposed Side Elevation; and, Proposed Rear Elevation.

Procedural Matters

2. During the Council's consideration of the planning application, revised drawings were submitted, which reduced the height and depth of the extension. The application was determined on the basis of the revised drawings. I too have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling set within a predominantly residential area comprising similar properties. The existing property has a hipped roof constructed of red pantiles.
5. There are a number of properties on Kingswood Avenue, within proximity of the appeal property, that have large rear dormers, similar in size to the proposed. The design of these dormers varies, with some being almost the height of the ridgeline of the original host dwelling and having their cheeks continuing off the flank elevation of their host dwelling.
6. In addition, the fenestration of the existing dormer extensions also varies. Although there is some proportionality and alignment with the windows in the lower floors, this is not a strong characteristic of the extensions and is not readily discernible.
7. The proposed dormer extension would be almost the full width and height of the existing roof. Whilst its height would be greater than the extension on the adjoining property, 14 Kingswood Avenue, it would only be marginally so and would be lower than other extensions in the vicinity.
8. There would be one large area of glazing in the rear elevation of the extension, which would almost be full height. Whilst it would not align with the existing lower floor windows, it would be roughly central to the rear elevation of the dwelling thus ensuring that it would not appear unbalanced. Furthermore, the height of the glazing would emphasise the verticality of the dwelling and the proportions of its window panes would be sympathetic to the those on the lower floors.
9. It is proposed that the extension would be clad with 'grey boards', although it is not clear from the evidence before me what material they would be constructed from. The nearby dormer extensions are clad in red tiles. However, they have a flat finish rather than a pantile finish. Therefore, although similar in colour, I do not consider that they match the existing roof materials. The use of the grey boards on the proposed extension would provide a contemporary finish, which would be in marked contrast to the other dormer extensions. However, the use of such a contrasting material in this instance would reduce the overall visual bulk of the extension preventing the resultant dwelling from appearing top heavy, which it likely would if it was clad with red tiles as it would appear as a three-storey dwelling rather than a two-storey dwelling with a roof conversion.
10. Furthermore, the proposed hip to gable extension would reintroduce some symmetry between the host dwelling and No 14, which would have a positive effect on the pairing of the two dwellings and character and appearance of the street scene.
11. I find therefore that the proposal would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and therefore would comply with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy 2014, which seeks to ensure that development respects and enhances existing spaces and buildings. In addition, it would comply with Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006, which seek to ensure that development has regard to design and

alterations and extensions respect the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building.

12. I have had regard to the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2012, which provides specific guidance for dormer extensions. Whilst there would be some conflict with this guidance, given that there is a large number of similarly large dormer extensions within such close proximity to the appeal site, there is sufficient justification in this instance to depart from it. Regarding materials, the guidance states that 'in the vast majority of cases they should be constructed in materials to match those of the existing roof'. The use of the words 'in the vast majority' indicates that there are instances whereby other materials would be acceptable. For the reasons I have outlined above, I consider that this is one such instance.

Conditions

13. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council, having regard to the six tests set out in the Framework. For the sake of clarity and enforceability, I have amended the conditions as necessary.
14. For the avoidance of doubt, it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
15. In the interests of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene, it is essential that there is a pre-commencement condition regarding the external materials. However, as I have outlined above, the materials need not match the host dwelling.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Alexander Walker

INSPECTOR