



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3371386

7 Stonedene, Meanwood, Leeds LS6 4NU

- 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 Sinead Hughes against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02887/FU.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension to side and rear, including enlarged window to side; part garage conversion to habitable room including new door to rear and window to side; demolition of existing conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed single storey extension to side and rear, including enlarged window to side and demolition of the existing conservatory.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the works to the garage; planning permission is granted for the part garage conversion to habitable room including new door to rear and window to side at 7 Stonedene, Meanwood, Leeds LS6 4NU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/02887/FU and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out below:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Drawing 01 - Location Plan; Drawing 04 - Proposed Floor Plan; and Drawing 06 - Proposed Elevations so far as they relate to the hereby approved development.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the hereby approved development shall match that of the existing built form.

Procedural Matters

3. 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 Issue

4. The Council considered that the part garage conversion to habitable room including new door to rear and window to side was acceptable. I have no substantive

evidence to lead me to a different conclusion upon this part of the proposed development.

5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed single storey extension to side and rear, including enlarged window to side, and demolition of the existing conservatory (the proposed development) on the living conditions of occupiers of No. 6 Stonedene.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a modest end terrace property located within a predominantly residential area. The appeal property's rear elevation is set back in comparison to the adjoining property, No. 6 Stonedene, there is also a slight change in ground level between the two properties, with the appeal site being at a higher level.
7. A mature hedge with timber fence screens the existing conservatory, to a degree, from the outlook of occupiers of No. 6 Stonedene. The proposed development would be closer to the shared boundary than the conservatory. The appellant confirms that the existing hedge would likely be removed due to the siting of the proposed development, although the fence is proposed to be retained, the proposed development would be a prominent feature in the outlook of occupiers of No. 6.
8. Whilst the appellant contends that the proposed development would be a reduction in height in comparison to the existing conservatory, the elongated projection comprising a blank stone wall close to shared boundary would be overbearing and oppressive to the outlook of the occupiers of No. 6.
9. The proposed development would be located to the north-east of No. 6. There is a degree of overshadowing to the neighbouring property by virtue of the setback of the appeal property's rear elevation and the existing conservatory. The appellant has provided a Sun Path Analysis Diagram; whilst this denotes the sun path, it does not demonstrate that overshadowing would not be exacerbated.
10. The conservatory has glazed windows facing No. 6; whilst these are screened to a degree by the boundary treatment, the proposed development would reduce the potential for overlooking. Nevertheless, I find that the proposed development would create a dominant built form, which would result in a poor outlook from the windows at No. 6 and would be overbearing in terms of scale.
11. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of occupiers of No. 6 Stonedene. With regard to the main issue relating to living conditions, 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 Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) (the UDP) which, amongst other things, seek to protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents.
12. There is conflict with Policy HDG2 of the Leeds City Council, Householder Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document (2012), which seeks to ensure development protects the amenity of neighbours.
13. There is also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), which seeks to ensure developments have high standards of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

14. The appellant has raised procedural concerns relating to the determination of the application, in relation to the lack of contact between the Council and the appellant in an attempt to overcome the issues which the appellant considers contrary to the Council's protocol. Whilst this maybe the case, this is beyond the remit of this appeal and does not influence my findings.
15. Whilst third party objections were not received during the application process this does not outweigh the harm I have identified.
16. The appellant contends that the current living accommodation is inadequate for a three-bedroom family home, and that the proposed development would provide much needed living space. Even so, this does not influence my findings.
17. The appellant has suggested minor amendments could alleviate concerns, such as a reduction in overall height and eaves height of the proposed development, along with replacing the current boundary fence with a 2m fence. I have no substantive evidence before me to confirm that these amendments would mitigate the effect of the development on the living conditions of occupiers of No. 6 Stonedene.

Conclusion and Conditions

18. I find the proposed part garage conversion to habitable room, including new door to rear and window to side, is clearly severable both physically and functionally from the proposed single storey extension to side and rear, including enlarged window to side and demolition of the existing conservatory.
19. I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the part garage conversion to habitable room, including new door to rear and window to side. However, in relation to the proposed single storey extension to side and rear, including enlarged window to side and demolition of the existing conservatory, the appeal should be dismissed.
20. In respect of the part garage conversion to habitable room, including new door to rear and window to side, I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. I have also added conditions concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR