



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2023

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3327883

8 Sunningdale Walk, Alwoodley, Leeds LS17 7SG

- 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 Prasath Manimaran against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/02313/FU, dated 14 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is roof alteration & rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for roof alteration & rear dormer at 8 Sunningdale Walk, Leeds LS17 7SG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/02313/FU, dated 14 April 2023, 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: Location plan; 2379-1.
 - 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.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the bathroom window in the rear dormer window hereby permitted shall be obscurely glazed to at least level 3 obscurity and permanently retained as such.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Sunningdale Walk and the surrounding streets feature a variety of detached and semi-detached two-storey houses, and dormer bungalows, with pitched gable roofs sited either parallel or perpendicular to the road. Many of the houses have been extended, including large rear dormers that can be seen from the street.
4. The appeal property is one of a pair of gable-fronted detached houses located at the end of a short cul-de-sac, beyond which is an area of woodland. The

proposal seeks to rotate the roof ninety degrees and construct a flat-roofed box dormer at the rear.

5. These works would clearly change the appearance of the house, and the pairing with No 6 would be lost. Nonetheless, the change would only be visible over a very short distance and in a context of the current varied styles and orientation of the existing properties in the immediate surroundings. Neither the height, nor the gable form of the house would be altered, and together with the use of matching materials, would ensure that the proposal would not appear significantly out of place in the street scene.
6. Although the large dormer would dominate the rear roof slope, it would be confined to the rear where the only public views would be glimpsed and in a context of other similar dormers. As such, whilst there is some conflict with the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (the SPD) in relation to the size of the dormer, the effect on the street scene would be minimal.
7. Overall, I am satisfied that the development could be accommodated without causing harm to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. The proposal therefore complies with the underlying design aims of Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (amended 2019); Saved Policies BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds City Council Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006); and Policy HDG1 of the SPD. The proposal also complies with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework with regards to achieving well designed places.

Other Matters

8. The Council did not identify any harm to neighbouring occupiers with regards to outlook, light and privacy. Based on my own observations, I have no reason to disagree with the Council's assessment of these matters. Thus, whilst I have taken the neighbour's concerns into account, it does not lead me to a different conclusion.

Conditions

9. As suggested by the Council, I have imposed the standard commencement and approved plans conditions for certainty. A condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building would ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development. A condition requiring obscure glazing to the bathroom window in the dormer is imposed in the interests of privacy.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR