



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2025

by **C Mayes CMLI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3361692

24 Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge, Leeds LS16 7HR

- 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 & Mrs Holiday against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/06380/FU.
 - The development proposed is removal of existing car port and garage and erection of single storey front, side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one half of a pair of brick-built, two-storey semi-detached houses in a predominantly residential area. Houses in the area are generally of a similar style and period and the appeal property is consistent with this. Each pair of semi-detached houses is evenly spaced from each other. There is some variety in the architectural detailing of and materials used in pairs of semi-detached houses. However, the character and appearance of the area is derived, primarily, from a consistent and repeated pattern of paired dwellings of reasonably symmetrical form and with pleasant visual balance.
4. The appeal property is set within modest sized gardens to the front and rear. In common with many properties in the area, the house has a hardstanding vehicle drive to the side that leads to a detached single garage and access to the rear garden. The driveway is covered by an open carport that maintains visual separation between the pairs of semi-detached houses that adds to the rhythm and pattern of development in the area.
5. The proposed development would replace the existing carport and single garage with a ground floor, single-storey extension. The development would occupy a similar footprint to the carport and garage, extending from close to the front elevation of the house into the rear garden.
6. A door to the front elevation of the extension, close to the existing front entrance, would allow access directly from the driveway. The front half of the extension would have a mono-pitched roof. To the front, the roof would be hipped to allow it to wrap around the front elevation of the house and provide a continuous roofline, forming a canopy over the existing and proposed entrance doors.

7. Although stepped back a short distance, the front elevation of the extension would visually coalesce with the front elevation of the existing house, due to their proximity and the proposed continuous roofline. This would result in an uncomfortable hierarchical relationship between the two entrance doors that would be at odds with and unbalance the architectural character and appearance of the host building. Moreover, the development would disrupt the marked balance in the architecture of the pair of semi-detached houses and the rhythm and pattern of development in the surrounding area.
8. The appellant has pointed to examples of dwellings within the vicinity that have been altered or extended with side extensions. In each case the properties are set within a different context. Moreover, the side extensions in each case are set well back from the front elevation of the house such that the entrances remain distinct and do not unbalance the appearance of the host buildings. In addition, none of the examples have a continuous roofline extending from the extension to the front elevation of the house.
9. As such, I find the examples presented to me are not directly comparable to, nor occur within the same context as, the appeal development before me. Accordingly, I have afforded these examples limited weight in my assessment.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would result in a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area. Hence, it would conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy, September 2019, and Policies BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan, reviewed 2006. Among other things, these seek to ensure that development is appropriate to its context and respects the scale, form and detailing of the original building. For the same reasons, I find the proposal would not accord with Policy HDG1 of the Council's Householder Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document, 2012.

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge that the proposal would provide convenient storage for everyday domestic items, such as prams, bikes, coats and shoes that would otherwise clutter the existing entrance hall, which would improve the living conditions of occupants of the house. While I have taken these benefits into account, they do not justify the harm identified above.
12. The rear of the property can only be accessed to the side of the house proposed for development. I note that there would be insufficient space for an external door to the side of the proposed extension. Therefore, a front facing door would be required to allow occupants to move items such as garden waste and tools from the back of the property to the front without having to pass through the existing kitchen and entrance hall. However, this is insufficient justification for allowing the proposed development as a whole and the resultant harm I have found.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

C Mayes

INSPECTOR