
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2025

by **David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/25/3374926

17 St Martins Avenue, Leeds, West Yorkshire, LS7 3LQ

- 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 Parminder Syan against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/03166/FU.
 - The development proposed is retrospective application for first floor front extension including alterations to existing porch to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by an amended version on the decision notice and in subsequent appeal documents. I consider that subsequent description to accurately represent the proposal and I have therefore used it within this decision. It is indicated that the application was submitted retrospectively, and the development was in place at the time of my visit.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscape.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is 1 of a pair of semi-detached dwellings. Prior to the development, the appeal site had 2-storey bay windows to the front, with the main front elevation set back above a porch. This reflected the arrangement of the attached property, which gave this pair of dwellings a pleasing symmetry.
5. The appeal site is part of a pleasant suburban streetscape which is characterised by semi-detached dwellings with a 2-storey bay and a set-back front elevation above a porch or canopy. Although there is some variation in the design of individual dwellings, the similar appearance of the front elevations contributes to the rhythm and character of the streetscape.
6. Within this context, the appeal proposal appears as a jarring feature that contrasts uncomfortably with its immediate neighbours and the wider character of the streetscape. In particular, it disrupts the symmetrical relationship with the adjoining dwelling.

7. Although the proposal does not project forward of the footprint of the dwelling and is set back from the highway, the flat elevation created by the proposal is of a stark and incongruous character that leads to significant harm to the character of the host building and the streetscape. The use of a traditional door design and matching materials do little to mitigate for this harm.
8. The appellant refers to other properties on St Martins Avenue which have had similar extensions. However, one of these properties was given planning permission some time ago, and the Council sets out that another was constructed without the benefit of planning permission. It has therefore not been demonstrated that those extensions represent parallel circumstances to the appeal before me, including in respect of planning advice in place at that time. In any event, the extensions that I saw served to confirm the harm that can arise from proposals of this nature, as does the constructed appeal proposal.
9. I observed a number of other alterations and extensions to dwellings on St Martins Avenue, including a number of roof alterations. However, despite these alterations, it is still possible to appreciate the original form of the dwellings and the character of the streetscape, particularly at first floor level on the front elevation.
10. Reference is also made to dwellings in the wider estate. However, these are some distance from the appeal site and do not set a prevailing context for the proposal.
11. The appellant contends that St Martins Avenue is a cul-de-sac with limited public visibility. However, regardless of the nature of the road and traffic passing along it, the extension is visible in views of the dwellings and along the streetscape from the public realm, and the nature of the highway to the front does not negate my conclusions on the harm to character and appearance.
12. No objections to the proposal were received from residents in the area and I note the letters of support from Councillors. I am also mindful that the proposal creates additional living space and would comply with the building regulations. But these matters do not outweigh or lead me to a different conclusion on the harm arising from the proposal. Although the site is not within a conservation area nor has any other heritage or Article 4 designation, this does not detract from the importance to be given to matters of character and appearance.
13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal will lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscape. The proposal would therefore be contrary to character and appearance requirements of Policies P10 and P12 of the Core Strategy 2019 and GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework with regards to achieving well-designed places. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice of the Householder Design Guide SPD in respect of design and appearance.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR