



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2024

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/24/3339354

131 Kedleston Road, Moor Allerton, Leeds LS8 2AU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Simon Lewandowski against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/06245/FU.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing single storey rear extension & garage to side; construct two storey side extension & single storey extensions to front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two storey side and single storey front extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling occupies a prominent position close to the junction of Kedleston Road with Chelwood Drive. From a number of vantage points in the vicinity of the junction and along Kedleston Road itself, the proposed side and front extensions would be readily visible due to their size and their positioning. There is a notable absence of any two storey extensions to the sides of the nearest dwellings, nor are there any front projections of any significance or impact present to the adjacent properties. This gives the street scene in this immediate location a visually coherent and consistent feel, and it contributes positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
4. The pair of semi-detached dwellings of which the host dwelling is part are not identical owing to a ground floor extension that exists to the side of 129 Kedleston Road and the garage to the appeal dwelling. And whilst a two storey side extension would inevitably unbalance the pair of dwellings, the Council has not suggested that the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD) precludes such an extension *per se*, although the SPD does note that this can often be difficult as such properties are designed as a symmetrical pair. There is a lessened concern about terracing between properties arising too, owing to the fact that 133 Kedleston Road is angled away and well separated from the boundary with the appeal dwelling.
5. The SPD does however also seek to ensure that extensions achieve some degree of subserviency and states that in most circumstances they should be

subordinate. Given that the proposed side extension would be of a significant width, the limited setback of its front elevation and the minimal drop down in its ridge height would do little to aid it in achieving a subservient relationship to the original dwelling. Furthermore, the roof over the proposed porch and in front of the proposed garage would extend a substantial distance beyond the existing front elevation of the dwelling and its bay window. This in itself would be a dominant and incongruous feature to the front of the dwelling, and one that would not be typical within the street scene. Collectively, what is proposed would not appear subservient or subordinate to the original dwelling and this would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

6. My attention has been drawn to several other extensions to dwellings in the locality which the appellant considers are similar in their design and their impact to the appeal proposal. I viewed each of these during my visit to the area. Some are less prominently located than the appeal site and some are not directly comparable in their design, but there are examples amongst them of development that fails to achieve subserviency and which includes forward projections. However, I have no details before me as to whether those extensions were permitted before or after the SPD had been adopted and, in any event, none form part of the street scene in which the appeal property is viewed. They do not therefore justify the harm that would be caused by the appeal proposal.
7. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed two storey side and single storey front elevations would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, they would fail to accord with Policies P10 and P12 of the Core Strategy 2019 and Saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Unitary Development Plan 2006, where they seek to safeguard character and appearance. There would also be a conflict with the aims of Policy HDG1 of the SPD in the same regard, and with the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks to achieve well-designed and beautiful places.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR