

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2021

by Patrick Hanna MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/21/3282100

3 Windermere Drive, Alwoodley, Leeds LS17 7UZ

- 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 Grahame White against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02711/FU, dated 28 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations including three dormer windows to front, extend driveway and conversion of double garage to form habitable rooms; single storey extension and roof lights to rear; relocation of boundary wall to side and garden shed to other side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations including three dormer windows to front, extend driveway and conversion of double garage to form habitable rooms; single storey extension and roof lights to rear; relocation of boundary wall to side and garden shed to other side at 3 Windermere Drive, Alwoodley, Leeds LS17 7UZ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/02711/FU, dated 28 March 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2406-2100 (location/block plans); 2406-2101 (ground floor plan); 2406-2102 (upper floor plans); 2046-2103 (front/rear elevations); 2046-2104 (side elevations); and 2046-2105 (section).

Procedural matter

2. The description of development was amended from the application form to the above description during the application, with the agreement of the parties. I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a corner plot within a residential street containing several house types. The existing dwelling is a two-storey detached building with

stepped roof and wall head dormers to the central and lower side of the roof. The eastern side garden wall is slightly set back from the footway. The effect of the proposal would be to install full dormers in the central and higher side of the roof, and align the garden wall with the footway.

5. The location of the two existing wall head dormers in the lower section of the roof has the effect of leaving a relatively large expanse of roof plane to the higher section. The proposed dormers would be sited within that larger part of the roof plane. Even with five dormers in total, adequate and proportionate margins would be maintained around the proposed dormers, such that the roof plane would not be overwhelmed.
6. The dormers themselves would be of a scale that would be subordinate to the roof and to the rest of the dwelling, and would not dominate it. The design of the proposed dormers would match the existing dormers, as well as being of the same size and proportions, such that the existing features of the dwelling would be maintained and respected. The dormers would continue the vertical alignment of the existing windows, thereby maintaining the appearance and existing asymmetry of the host dwelling.
7. The appeal dwelling house type, with its wall head dormers and large roof plane, is replicated multiple times along the street. The proposal would introduce the first such roof dormers in the street. Even so, given the prevalence and prominence of existing wall head dormers along the street, which the proposed roof dormers would match, the uniformity of the street scene would not be adversely affected. Overall, the proposed dormers would not be harmful to any significant degree.
8. The Leeds Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012)(SPD) states that dormer windows to the front will not normally be considered acceptable, particularly on unbroken roof slopes. However, this guidance is qualified, and it also sets out design guidelines for when dormers could be considered acceptable, against which I find the proposal to be acceptable for the above reasons.
9. In respect of the alterations to the boundary wall, the delegated report indicates that it would match the design and materials of the side wall at adjacent No 1 Windermere Drive, concluding that the harm would be minimal. Even though a small landscaped area to the front of the existing wall would be lost to the street scene, the effect of the proposal would be no different to the arrangement that already exists at No 1 and No 2 Windermere Drive and which prominently frames the existing entrance to the street.
10. Whilst the relocated wall would result in a small incursion into the spaciousness and openness of the street, this would be offset in visual terms by the prominent area of public open space opposite the appeal site, and views to the open countryside beyond. Overall, the proposed boundary treatment would be appropriate to the area.
11. I conclude that the proposal would not have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal accords with policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (2019), saved policies BD6 and N25 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006), the Alwoodley Neighbourhood Plan (2018), the SPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework. Together these policies require that new development

should be based on a thorough contextual analysis and provide good design that is appropriate to its location and scale, with site boundaries appropriate to the surrounding area.

Conclusion

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

Patrick Hanna

INSPECTOR