



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/25/3369743

210 Sandgate Drive, Kippax, Leeds, LS25 7QS

- 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 Spencer Hargrave and Tanya Spink against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02584/FU.
 - The development proposed is part two/part single storey front extension, garage conversion to front, single storey side and rear extension, wood burner flue to side and boundary wall to side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of both the existing dwelling and the streetscene; and whether adequate on-site vehicle parking space would remain available to serve the property.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling with an integral garage which is located in prominent corner position, within a residential area. House types along Sandgate Drive vary in terms of their size and appearance with a number having been altered and extended since they were originally built. The appeal property has an open plan front/side garden, which contributes to the spatial appearance of the corner plot.
4. The proposal has several different elements, which are to construct a part two storey/part single storey front extension, convert the existing integral garage into a ground floor bedroom, construct a single storey side and rear extension, erect a wood burning flue and construct a 1m high boundary wall along the side boundary with Shuttocks Fold. The proposal would add significantly to the living space within the dwelling, and I accept that it would enhance the accommodation and bring benefits to the applicants.
5. The Council considers that the proposed front extensions would be dominant additions that would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the property and the streetscene. Similar concerns are also raised in relation to the proposed side/rear extension and boundary wall, which the Council consider would be harmful to the open setting of the property.

6. Policy P10 of the Council's Core Strategy Review 2019, seeks to ensure (amongst other things) that the design of new development is of a high standard and reflects the character of the area. 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. Policy N25 requires boundary treatments to have regard to the character of the area. Policy BE1 of the Kippax Neighbourhood Plan also requires new and extended buildings to reflect the character of the area.
7. The above policies accord with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024, which contains similar provisions. Further guidance is contained in The Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Householder Design Guide 2012. Amongst other things, it states that extensions should respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.
8. Whilst there are certain elements of the proposal that I consider to be acceptable, such as the garage conversion, the wood burning flue and the single storey front extension, the proposed two storey front extension would appear an unduly dominant and alien feature that would be at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of the streetscene. Furthermore, the proposed side projection of the single storey side and rear extension, together with the proposed boundary wall would unacceptably impact on the existing open character of the streetscene, which currently exists along Shuttocks Fold.
9. In reaching my decision, I have considered the letters of support from third parties, and I also viewed the extensions that have taken place on other properties in the locality, including at 53 Sangate Drive and 5 Shuttocks Fold. Whilst I accept that there are similarities, I am not persuaded that they contribute positively to the streetscene and, therefore, they should not create a precedent for this appeal.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude on this issue that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of both the existing dwelling and the streetscene. Consequently, it would conflict with the relevant policies of the Development Plan, as referred to above.

Vehicle Parking

11. The Council questions whether adequate on-site parking can be provided to serve the extended dwelling. At my site visit, I noted that a car was parked on the existing drive and there was a further car parked on the road outside the property close to the junction with Shuttocks Fold. Notwithstanding, I agree with the appellant, that the current driveway can accommodate 2 vehicles and there is an option to widen it to accommodate a further vehicle, if necessary. In my opinion, this matter could have been addressed by a planning condition had the proposal been acceptable in all other respects. Therefore, I do not find against the proposal on this issue.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR