



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by **P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3374971

38 Haigh Moor Road, Tingley, Wakefield, Leeds WF3 1ED

- 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 Jamie Moncaster against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/03835/FU.
 - The development proposed is Erection of a two story side extension, and rear loft conversion into habitable space including a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a 2 storey semi-detached house. Although house designs and sizes vary along Haigh Moor Road, houses close to the appeal site share common characteristics. They include red brick walls, pantile clay tiled hipped roofs and 2 storey square front projecting bays.
4. The proposed development includes a hip to gable roof extension and full width rear dormer. A 2 storey hipped roof side extension would be set back from the front elevation and down from the main roof ridge and have a small flat roofed side projecting element. The side extension and rear dormer would be finished with black vertical timber cladding and the red roof tiles replaced with grey tiles. The rendered bay would be clad in timber.
5. The hip to gable roof extension would appear at odds with the hipped roofs on similarly designed houses nearby, and the adjoining house, No 36, which has side extensions with hipped roofs. The hipped roof on the proposed side extension would be joined to the newly formed gable end and the mismatch between the roof designs would appear awkward and contrived.
6. Although extensions to No 36 have reduced the symmetry that the pair of houses would have originally shared, the proposed extensions would fail to harmonise with the adjoining property, or reflect the design of the original house, and consequently further unbalance the appearance of the pair. The imbalance would be compounded by the contrasting colour of the timber cladding with the existing

brickwork and the proposed roof tiles which would be at odds with the reddish-brown colour of tiles on properties of a similar age and design, including No 36. Also, the extent of the proposed timber cladding would be out of keeping with properties nearby where it is generally restricted to sections of gable roofs and front bays, rather than whole elevations of extensions.

7. The rear dormer would be set down from the roof ridge but extend across the full width of the original dwelling and dominate the roof, rather than being subservient to it. It would be particularly conspicuous from Unit Hall Court which is a small development of 3 houses which face towards the rear of houses on Haigh Moor Road and is accessed along the side of the appeal site. In combination, the various elements of the proposal would dominate the host dwelling and lead to a disjointed appearance which would fail to respect the character and appearance of the original building and surrounding houses.
8. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would conflict with Policies P10 and P12 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), Policy BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006), Policy HDG1 of the House Holder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which require high quality design that respects the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building and the character of the surrounding area.

Other matters

9. I have had regard to the examples of other developments provided by the appellant. I note that houses in the area have different external finishes, including No 86 which is rendered rather than having exposed brickwork. Nonetheless, none of the semi-detached houses that I saw were extensively covered in timber cladding, or materials that contrasted so obviously with adjoining properties as that proposed in the appeal scheme.
10. None of the extensions and dormers on houses nearby were as disjointed, in terms of the different roof forms and use of materials, as the proposed scheme. Also, I do not consider that the fence and hedges along the side of Unity Hall Court would lessen the visual harm to any significant degree, as suggested by the appellant. The examples given are not therefore directly comparable to the appeal proposal. In any case, I must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits, rather than relying on the approach the council may have taken elsewhere.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR