



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2021

by C Coyne BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17/02/2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/21/3286243

5 Kingswood Grove, Moor Allerton, Leeds LS8 2BY

- 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 Vanessa Hartley against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/06815/FU, dated 8 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as 'partial first floor bedroom extension over existing ground floor porch'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor extension to front at 5 Kingswood Grove, LEEDS, LS8 2BY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/06815/FU, dated 8 August 2021, and the plans submitted with it, 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 Number 2021399.01, Drawing Number 2021399.03, Drawing Number 2021399.04.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has described the development as 'first floor extension to front'. I note that the appellant has also utilised this description on their appeal form. I consider that this revision provides a succinct and accurate description of the proposal and I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a front porch located within a predominately residential area. The other properties on Kingswood Grove comprise similar two storey semi-detached dwellings. The properties in the surrounding area are primarily also semi-detached two storey dwellings with a similar architectural style. The adjacent property no. 3 has a single storey front and side extension.

5. The proposal would extend out to the front of the appeal property above the existing ground floor front porch. The height of its roof eaves would be the same as the host property. Its roof ridge height would be considerably lower than that of the appeal property. Given its scale, height and design the proposal would appear visually subservient to the host property. Its material finish would also complement that of the existing building. As a result, I find that it would not appear overly dominant thereby not having an adverse visual impact on the host property.
6. On my site visit, I observed that many dwellings in the surrounding area had what appeared to be front extensions like the proposal. I also saw that one other property on the Kingswood Grove, no. 10, also had what appeared to be a first-floor front extension like the proposal, the main difference being that it had a flat roof rather than a hipped roof. Consequently, notwithstanding the minor difference in roof styles, I also find that the proposal would not represent a discordant addition to the street scene. Furthermore, it would therefore also reflect the other similar extensions to other properties in the area which form part of its character and appearance. The proposal would therefore also not have an adverse visual impact in this regard either.
7. I note that the Council has raised a concern that the proposal would unbalance the appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings to which the host property belongs. However, given that the adjacent property no. 3 has a ground floor front and side extension I consider that the pair of properties are already somewhat visually unbalanced. I therefore consider that the proposal would also not have an adverse impact in this regard.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not materially harm the character and appearance of the street scene and area. Accordingly, it would not conflict with the relevant requirements of Policy P10 of the adopted Core Strategy, saved policies BD6 and GP5 of the adopted Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review, and policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document. It would also accord with paragraph 130 c) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

9. I note that interested parties have raised a concern that the proposal would be in front of the building line of the rest of the street. However, it would not project past the front building line of the existing porch and as outlined above it would not have an adverse visual impact. As a result, this matter does not alter my findings on the main issue.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard implementation condition, I have imposed a necessary condition to define the plans with which the scheme should accord in the interest of precision. I have also imposed a condition specifying that the materials match those of the existing building in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Coyne

INSPECTOR