
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2025 by S Jamieson BA (Hons) MPlan

Decision by C Carpenter BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3371878

12 Low Farm, Great Preston, Leeds LS26 8AD

- 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 Mrs Katie Foster against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02709/FU.
 - The development proposed is: Demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of part single storey, part 2 storey rear extension. Demolition of existing front porch and erection of 1.5 storey front extension connecting to garage with bedroom and en-suite above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The Council has not raised an issue with the proposed part single and part two storey rear extension. Given its siting to the rear of the appeal site and the proposed design and use of matching materials, I have no reason to form a different view.
4. Therefore, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed front extension on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property (No 12) is located at the end of a T-shaped residential cul-de-sac which mostly comprises similar two-storey, detached dwellings. There is a relatively simple roofscape, interrupted occasionally by single gable elements, along with broadly consistent fenestration patterns and a predominance of multi-toned brickwork, with some partial rendering. While a number of properties have been extended to the side, these additions are generally modest in scale, subordinate to the host dwelling, and maintain a degree of separation from the neighbouring property. Overall, this lends a sense of order and coherence to the street scene and contributes positively to its spacious character.
6. Even accounting for the angled orientation of the appeal property and the proposed relocation of the dwelling's main entrance so that it would be more visible from the public domain, the proposed front extension would result in an uncharacteristic

L-shaped building that would not reflect the original design of the host property or the prevailing form of development along the street.

7. By virtue of its overall height and forward projection, the extension would substantially infill the space between No 12 and the garage of the neighbouring property at 10 Low Farm, restricting views of the mature trees to the rear and resulting in an unduly bulky and cramped form of development. While I recognise this might aid natural surveillance, this would be at the expense of the open and spacious quality of this part of Low Farm. Further, I do not agree the proposed front extension would create a natural end to the street.
8. I note that the dormer windows have been designed to minimise the perceived height of the extension. However, dormers are not a feature of the roofscape and the introduction of two such windows would read as visually discordant and uncharacteristic additions. Moreover, the proposed eave and ridge heights would not align with the host dwelling, resulting in an extension that, despite the proposed use of matching materials, would appear squat and poorly integrated, thereby further emphasising the extension's incongruous appearance.
9. Guidance in the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) states that very small additions to the front of properties might be possible but larger additions are unlikely to be acceptable. While the appeal dwelling might be set back from the front boundary and the wider street is not entirely uniform in appearance, for the above reasons, the proposal would harm the character of the locality. It would therefore not be fully consistent with the exceptional circumstances for two-storey front extensions envisaged in the SPD.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude the proposed front extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) which, amongst other things, requires development to provide good design that is appropriate to its location. It would also conflict with saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) which require development proposals to resolve detailed design considerations and for extensions to respect the scale, form and detailing of the original building. For the same reasons, the proposal would also conflict with the requirements for good design in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

11. I note the appellant's comments about the Council's handling of the planning application and the timescale involved in this case. This is not however a land use planning matter and would not in itself be a reason to allow the appeal.
12. The effect of the proposal on highways and on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers are not contested between the main parties. On the evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree. However, these are neutral factors that do not overcome the harm I have found.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

C Carpenter

INSPECTOR