



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2025

by **Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3369668

9 Baildon Drive, Leeds, LS14 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 Mr David McKenna against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01377/FU.
 - The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its surroundings, and its effect on the living conditions of a neighbouring property, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal proposal is an end-of-terrace two storey dwelling, which is situated within a residential estate comprised largely of terraced blocks of houses and blocks of flats. The terrace containing the appeal property is a rectangular block of a relatively simple design and appearance with gabled roofs. The flats have a different mono pitched roof design. A public footpath runs along the side of the appeal dwelling and the side gable wall of the property faces the front walls of dwellings that are sited on the opposite side of the path.
4. The proposal is to construct a part two storey/part single storey side extension, which would infill much of the space between the existing side wall of the dwelling. The two storey element would have gabled roof and would be set-back from the existing front wall of the property. The single storey part would be built in line with the front of the dwelling and would have a lean-to roof.
5. The Council considers that the proposal would fail to reflect the design and character of the existing dwelling. It argues that the 'staggered' design conflicts with the horizontal emphasis of the existing terrace and that the lean-to roof would also be out of character. In addition, the Council concludes that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the spacious setting of the public footpath.
6. Policy P10 of the Council's Core Strategy Review 2019 (CSR), seeks to ensure (amongst other things) that the design of new development is of a high standard,

that it reflects the character of the area and protects amenity. Policies BD6 and GP5 of the Unitary Development Plan Review 2006 require alterations and extensions to respect the scale and form of the original building and for proposals to avoid loss of amenity.

7. The above policies accord with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024, which contains similar provisions. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Householder Design Guide 2012 also emphasises that all extensions and alterations should respect the main dwelling with particular attention to (amongst other things) roof form.
8. Whilst the proposal would result in a somewhat disjointed appearance, I consider the two storey element to be acceptable in design terms. It would be set-back well behind the main front wall of the dwelling and as such, the existing/original character and form of the dwelling would be clear and identifiable.
9. However, that cannot be said of the single storey element, which would be at odds and harmful to the appearance and character of the property, due primarily to its roof design. Whilst the roof design is similar to that on other buildings nearby, it does not reflect the character of the appeal property and the terrace, of which it is a part.
10. In addition, the existing undeveloped area of side garden contributes to the sense of openness of the adjacent footpath, which is a positive characteristic of the area. Although no site plan was provided as part of the planning application, a plan is included in the appellant's grounds of appeal. It is evident that the extension would cover much of the existing open side garden area and I consider that the proposal would have an overly dominant and oppressive impact that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude on this issue of character and appearance that the proposal would conflict with the policies of the Development Plan, as referred to above.

Amenity

12. The existing side gable wall of the appeal property is situated opposite the front of neighbouring dwellings that are positioned on the opposite side of the footpath. The Council considers that the two storey extension would have an unacceptably harmful impact on the outlook from the main windows of number 45 Baildon Drive (number 45). It contends that it would conflict with Policy P10 of the CSR, which is referred to above.
13. The appellant's appeal statement provides some factual detail on this issue, including separation distances between the appeal property and number 45. This distance is shown as 9.5m. A distance of 11m is also shown between the appeal property and number 47 Baildon Drive. Whilst the Council's Housing Design Guide would normally require a separation distance of 12m, the impact on number 45 would not, in my opinion, be significantly greater than it is at present, notwithstanding the fact that the side wall of the appeal dwelling would be some 2.8m closer.
14. Accordingly, I conclude on this issue that the proposal would not conflict with Policy P10 of the CSR.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons in relation to character and appearance, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR