



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2025

**by Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20<sup>th</sup> March 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3359244**

**24 Longwood Crescent, Alwoodley, Leeds LS17 8SR**

- 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 Mr Michael Kelly against the decision of Leeds City Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/06231/FU.
  - The development proposed is proposed extension to form new bedroom above existing garage.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed extension to form new bedroom above existing garage at 24 Longwood Crescent, Leeds LS17 8SR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/06231/FU, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: Site Location Plan; Floor Plans as Proposed.
  - 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.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 3 Longwood Close.

### Reasons

#### *Character and Appearance*

3. The appeal site is located on Longwood Crescent, close to the junction with Longwood Close. This is a residential area comprising of predominantly detached and semi-detached dwellings set back from the road behind open front gardens.
4. Longwood Crescent is characterised by a consistent pattern of pairs of semi-detached houses orientated in line with the road with regular gaps between them. Side extensions, where present, are typically single storey. As such, even where properties are extended to the side, there remains a discernible gap in the built form between adjacent dwellings. These factors contribute to the open, spacious character of the streetscene here.

5. The appeal property, No 24, is a semi-detached dwelling with a first floor dormer window extending for much of the width of its reasonably steeply pitched roof. Like a number of the dwellings here, it has a pitched roof garage extension attached to its gable, extending to the boundary with the adjacent dwelling, No 3 Longwood Close.
6. The predominantly blank rear elevation of No 3, a detached dwelling on a corner plot fronting Longwood Close, lies close to the boundary with the appeal property. As such, owing to the proximity of No 3 and the pitched roof garage extension of No 24, the gap in the built form here is narrower than the wider gaps between opposing pairs of semi-detached dwellings that characterise the streetscene. On this basis, the existing 'gap' at the appeal site, comprising predominantly of the single storey garage, contributes little to the character of the streetscene and is noticeably different to the gaps between pairs of semi-detached dwellings further along Longwood Crescent.
7. The appeal proposal would involve the construction of a first floor extension above the existing attached garage. The ridge of the roof would be increased in height although it would remain well below that of the main ridge. A dormer window would be provided to the front roof slope which would be consistent with the proportions of the existing dormer window. On this basis the extension would appear subservient to the host dwelling.
8. Owing to its position at the end of the row of semi-detached dwellings, its existing proximity to No 3 and its existing contribution to the character and appearance of the area, I am satisfied that the relatively minor increase in roof height proposed would not disrupt the spacious character of the streetscene here. It would therefore not represent an incongruous or unsympathetic addition. Similarly, owing to the difference in scale, design, and orientation between No 3 and the appeal property, I am not of the view that the proposal would lead to a terracing effect.
9. The Council references the Leeds Householder Design Guide SPD (the SPD). This advises that that in a street of regular, semi-detached dwellings at least a 1.0m gap should be maintained to the side boundary. However, the appeal site is at the end of such a street and the gap within which the extension would be provided is not between a pair of opposing semi-detached dwellings, as described above. Nonetheless, a small gap is present between the rear elevation of No 3 and the boundary fence. However, I am mindful that this is only guidance and cannot envisage every scenario.
10. For the above reasons, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would comply with Policies P10 and P12 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) (the CS) and Saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) (the UDP) which together, in summary, and amongst other things, seek to ensure new domestic extensions are of an acceptable design and respect the local townscape and character and appearance of the area.
11. There would also be compliance with the provisions of paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which sets out, amongst other things, that planning decisions should ensure new developments add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

### *Living Conditions*

12. As set out above, the dwelling at No 3 is a detached property with the majority of its windows located in the front and side elevations. Nonetheless, a first floor and ground floor window are located adjacent to the existing garage extension. The first floor window is obscure glazed and likely serves a bathroom. The ground floor window serves a dining room and faces onto the boundary fence between the two properties, with the existing garage extension at the appeal site lying adjacent. This window has a reasonably poor outlook, particularly in comparison to the windows on the other elevations of the dwelling. Owing to the proximity of the appeal property, which is set slightly forward of the ground floor window, light levels are likely significantly lower than those other windows.
13. In order to raise the height of the ridge of the roof, the proposal would add additional masonry to the existing gable of the garage extension. However, the extent of this addition would be relatively minor and would not significantly increase the bulk or massing of the gable. Moreover, the majority of this new fabric would be concentrated in the position of the new ridge, set well forward of the existing ground floor window at No 3. The dormer itself would be set away from the edge of the roof and the boundary with the neighbour. I am therefore satisfied that the occupiers of No 3 are unlikely to experience a significant reduction in outlook as a result of the proposed extension. Moreover, having regard to the existing situation, the proposal would not significantly reduce the levels of light to No 3 that are gained from the aforementioned window.
14. For the above reasons, the proposal would preserve the living conditions of the occupiers of No 3 Longwood Close. On this basis the proposal would comply with Policy P10 of the CS and Saved Policy GP5 of the UDP insofar as they seek to ensure new development preserves living conditions. The proposal would also comply with the provisions of paragraph 135 of the Framework which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure new developments provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
15. There would also be compliance with the SPD which seeks to ensure proposals protect the amenity of neighbours.

### **Conditions**

16. Together with the standard time limit condition, I have included a condition requiring compliance with the approved plans and the use of matching materials for clarity and in order to ensure the extension successfully integrates with the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion**

17. For the reasons set out above, I allow the appeal.

*Paul Martinson*

INSPECTOR