



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3368283

17 Ramshead Crescent, Seacroft, Leeds LS14 1PE

- 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 D Klemciukas against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02602/FU.
 - The development proposed is for raised deck to rear, with steps, and banister, to garden and fence to side
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council changed the description of development from that referenced in the application form. I note that the appellant also uses this on the appeal submission, I have adopted the revised description of development as this more accurately describes the development.
3. An amended plan has been submitted with the appeal which redesigns the development. The Council and third parties have not had the opportunity to comment on the plan during this appeal. I am therefore not convinced that parties would not be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal taking into account the amended plans. I have based my decision on the plan submitted to Council during the application process: Drawing No: LS14-101.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the development on (i) the character and appearance of the host property; and (ii) the living conditions of occupants of No's 15 and 19 Ramshead Crescent.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is a mid-terraced property within a predominantly residential area. There is a difference in levels between the floor level of the property and the rear garden, the rear garden lower. The proposed development would be screened to a degree due to its location at the rear of the property and existing boundary enclosures. Nevertheless, the increased height of the boundary treatment along the shared boundaries with No's 15 and 19 Ramshead Crescent would be obvious.

6. The scale of the proposed development would dominate the rear elevation of the host property and modest sized garden. The projection of the proposed decking at a height of 1.2 above the garden level, along with the proposed stairs, balustrade and screening would be an imposing structure incongruous to the host property.
7. I find that the development would harm the character and appearance of the host property. With regard to the main issue relating to character and appearance there is conflict with Policy P10 of the 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 seek to ensure developments are of good design and appropriate to character of the area.
8. There is conflict with Policy HDG1 of the Leeds City Council, Householder Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (the SPD) which seeks to ensure development respects the main dwelling and locality.
9. 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

10. A solid fence (1.1m in height) with decorative screening on top (0.6m excluding the decorative scallop top) combined with the height of the deck platform (1.2m) would be located along the shared boundaries with No's 15 and 19 Ramshead Crescent. The substantial scale of the overall structure would be an overbearing feature to the occupants of neighbouring properties.
11. Whilst the boundary treatment would mitigate overlooking to a degree the screening would not extend the full extent of the raised decking as such direct overlooking of the private rear gardens of No. 15 and 19 would ensue. Overlooking occurs at present between properties due to external steps located to the rear of the properties, however a large raised platform would exacerbate this.
12. I find that the development would harm the living conditions of occupants of No's 15 and 19 Ramshead 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.
13. There is conflict with the SPD which seeks to ensure development protects the amenity of neighbours. The proposed development conflicts with the Framework which seeks to ensure developments have high standards of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

14. I observed during my site visit that a neighbouring property has a similar raised deck to the rear of the property I have no details relating to the planning history of that development. I therefore give this limited weight.

Conclusion

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

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR