



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3374323

7 Moorland Crescent, Pudsey, Leeds LS28 8EW

- 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 Z Alum against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/04765/FU.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council changed the description of development from that referenced in the application form. In the interests of clarity, I have adopted the revised description of development.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the development on (i) the character and appearance of the host property and area in general; and (ii) the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is a modest semi-detached property situated within a predominantly residential area. Many properties in the area have been historically extended or altered. No. 5 Moorland Crescent attached to the appeal site has a modest single storey rear extension projecting approximately 3.6m along the shared boundary with the appeal site. No. 9 Moorland Crescent has a two-storey rear extension set off the shared boundary with the appeal site.
5. The development proposes a flat roof single storey extension with roof lantern which would replace an existing single storey extension. The proposed development would extend along the width of the rear of the property and would project 6.6m from the rear elevation. The scale of the proposed development would be at odds with the existing modest property and surrounding area. Whilst the appeal site has a generous private rear garden the proposed development would be an incongruous addition to the modest scale of the existing property.

6. I find that the development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and area in general. With regard to the main issue relating to character and appearance there is conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), Leeds Local Plan (the Core Strategy), and Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) (the UDP) which amongst other things seeks to ensure developments are of good design and appropriate to character of the area.
7. There is conflict with the Leeds City Council, Householder Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (the SPD) which seeks to ensure development respects the main property and locality.
8. There is also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework) which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.

Living Conditions

9. The proposed development would extend 3m beyond the predominantly glazed rear elevation of the single storey extension at No. 5 Moorland Crescent. The proposed development would provide a solid rendered wall close to the shared boundary creating an overbearing form of development in close proximity to the neighbouring property's windows.
10. Due to the location of the proposed development directly to the southwest of No. 5 the proposed development would cause overshadowing to the neighbouring property. The proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers at No. 5.
11. The proposed development includes 3 windows facing No. 9 Moorland Crescent. Whilst set off the boundary these windows would provide the opportunity for overlooking. Notwithstanding this overlooking would not be exacerbated due to the existing single storey extension at the appeal site which has a large area of glazing facing No. 9.
12. The appellant proposes to erect a new solid panelled boundary fence at a height of 1.8m to mitigate the effect of the development, whilst this would screen to a degree some of the proposed extension and views afforded from it due to its scale and location this would not overcome the harm I have identified to the occupiers of No. 5.
13. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of occupiers of No. 5 Moorland Crescent. With regard to the main issue relating to living conditions there is conflict with Policy P10 of the Core Strategy and Policies GP5 and BD6 of the UDP which amongst other things seek to protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents. There is conflict with the SPD and the Framework which seek to ensure development protect the amenity of neighbours.

Conclusion

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

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR