



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3368078

6 Moor Allerton Avenue, Leeds LS17 6SQ

- 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 Narinder Singh against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01754/FU.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and erection of part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension incorporating an attached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council changed the description of development from that referenced in the application form. I note that the appellant also uses this on the appeal form, I have adopted the revised description of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and area in general.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached property with detached garage to the side situated on a corner plot in a predominantly residential area. A number of properties in the area have been historically extended or altered.
5. Leeds City Council, Householder Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (the SPD) provides guidance for domestic extensions and alterations. The SPD outlines that side extensions should not exceed two thirds the width of the original property. The proposed development would not adhere to the SPD guidance.
6. The SPD also highlights that first floors should be setback 2m from the principal elevations to retain important gaps. The appeal property is on a corner plot and due to orientation a gap would be retained.
7. It is important to recognise that such guidance does not constitute a 'black and white' set of rules to be applied rigidly or exclusively when other material considerations indicate that an exception may be appropriate. In this instance the

lack of setback would be similar to the adjoining property No. 45 Moor Allerton Avenue. Whilst the extension to No. 45 would not comply with current guidance it nonetheless forms part of the character and appearance of the area, as such a proposed two storey side extension without setback would not look out of keeping.

8. In terms of the width the extension appears comparable to an extension at No. 45, however No. 45 has a hipped roof. Whilst the proposed gable with pitched roof would match the existing roof, as endorsed by the SPD, this would create bulk which would be visually overbearing on this corner plot.
9. The single storey rear extension would be modest in projection from the rear elevation. Nevertheless, the creation of an elongated built form resulting from the overall linked development would be dominant to the host property on this prominent corner plot which would be incongruous to the streetscene.
10. I find that the development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and area in general. There is conflict with Policies P10 and P12 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), Leeds Local Plan, Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) which amongst other things seeks to ensure developments are of good design, appropriate to context and respects the original building.
11. There is conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which seeks amongst other things to ensure developments are of good design and sympathetic to their surroundings.
12. There is conflict with Policy HDG1 of the SPD which seeks to ensure development respects the main property and locality.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR