



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3373295

7 Gainford Drive, Garforth, Leeds LS25 1HJ

- 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 Deborah Cross against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02728/FU.
 - The development proposed is to raise the rear portion of the main roof to enable an additional bedroom on the first floor.
-

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 Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and area in general

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached bungalow situated at the head of a cul-de-sac within a predominantly residential area. Gainford Drive is characterised by a mix of two storey semi-detached houses and detached bungalows. Whilst some properties, including the appeal property, have been altered or extended the bungalows share commonality in terms of features and height creating architectural harmony which adds to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The appeal bungalow has a stepped appearance similar to other bungalows in the immediate area, the proposed development would form another step in building form, increasing the height of the appeal property. The resulting development would create a bulky form of development which would dominate the existing bungalow and be at odds with the uniformity of the bungalows in the streetscene.
6. I observed during my site visit that there is a difference in levels between the appeal site and No. 5 Gainsford Drive which is confirmed by a Level Comparisons plan submitted by the appellant. I also noted that the appeal site is located adjacent a pair of semi-detached houses. Nevertheless, the scale of the proposed

development would be at odds with the existing property and those which share similar features in the streetscene. Whilst the proposed development would be set back from highway it would be an obvious and incongruous addition to the existing property.

7. I find that the development would add an unsympathetic addition to the appeal site which would harm the character and appearance of the host property and area in general. There is conflict with Policies P10 and P12 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), Leeds Local Plan and Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) which amongst other things seeks 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) which seeks to ensure development respects the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main property and locality.
9. There is also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has drawn my attention to a first-floor extension to a bungalow at No. 6 Purbeck Grove, whilst I have not been provided with substantive details to consider this against the proposal before me, the appellant confirms this was carried out under a permitted development process, as such it is not directly comparable to the proposal before me. 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.
11. The appellant confirms that the proposed development supports the long-term adaptability of the property, ensuring it meets modern living requirements and allows the appellant and partner to live together, providing space for individual needs. Allowing visiting families to support them as and when the time arises. I have not been provided with substantive evidence to demonstrate a need for the development or that the proposed development would be the only way to fulfil any demonstrated need, I therefore give this limited weight.

Conclusion

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

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR