



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3370798

39 Springbank Road, Farsley, Pudsey, Leeds LS28 5LS

- 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 Shaun McDonagh against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01933/FU.
 - The development proposed is Part two storey extension part single storey extension to side and rear; demolition of existing single storey rear extension and conservatory; steps with balustrade to rear 2 storey extension & single storey extension Internal reconfiguration.
-

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 semi-detached property within a predominantly residential area. The appeal plot lies on a curve of Spingbank Road, semi-detached properties in the area share similar features and have a uniformity in terms of design.
5. The attached neighbouring property No. 37 has a two-storey extension to the rear of the property which also projects to the side of the property. The Council confirm that this extension has not been carried out in accordance with the approved plans, I have not been provided with substantive details relating to the approved development. Notwithstanding this the proposed development would be larger than the extension to the neighbouring property.

6. Due to the bend in the road the proposed developments mass and design would be largely visible from the streetscene. The two-storey side/rear extension would add considerable bulk to the host property which would be not subservient.
7. The proposed development connects to the property in a disjointed manner, with its roof failing to integrate into the roof of the host building. I find that the proposed development relates poorly to the existing property and lacks cohesion.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to a development approved within the immediate area, No. 28 Wesley Street. From the information provided there are similarities between the approved scheme and the proposal before me in terms of roof design and scale. I observed during my site visit that No. 28 is sited slightly forward on the plot than No. 30 and due to the gap between properties the proposed development's scale would not be as obvious in the streetscene. Notwithstanding this each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.
9. The appellant has also provided photographs of other development carried out, I have not been provided with substantive details to compare these to the one before me, nonetheless I note that none are directly comparable to the appeal proposal.
10. 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 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, appropriate to context and respects the original building.
11. 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 property and locality.
12. 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

13. The proposed development would extend 4m beyond the rear elevation of the appeal property. The single storey extension would project along the shared boundary with No. 37 however the two-storey element would be set off the boundary by 2m at first floor.
14. I observed during my site visit that there are single storey extensions to the rear of the appeal site which extend beyond 4m, nevertheless the existing modest conservatory is a lightweight structure which is slightly stepped down from the existing single storey brick extension. Due to the scale and bulk of the proposed development including the dominant two-storey extension close to the boundary the proposed development would be overbearing and oppressive to the occupiers of the neighbouring property.
15. The proposed development would be located to the south of No. 37 whilst there maybe a degree of overshadowing to the neighbouring property now, the proposed

development would exacerbate this. I find that the proposed development would create a dominant built form which would result in a poor outlook from the windows at No. 37 and would be overbearing in terms of scale.

16. Whilst the proposed development would be prominent when viewed from the adjacent property No. 41, I find that the living conditions of the occupiers at No. 41 would not be harmed.
17. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of occupiers of No. 37 Springbank Road. 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.
18. There is conflict with the SPD which seeks to ensure development protects the amenity of neighbours.

Other Matters

19. The appellant contends a two-storey extension to the rear could be constructed under permitted development rights via The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). I have not been provided with substantive evidence for instance in the form of a certificate of lawful development to assess what works could take place under permitted development rights, as such I give this limited weight.

Conclusion

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

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR