



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by **P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3374605

61 Darnley Lane, Colton, Leeds LS15 9EY

- 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 Ben McNally against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/03500/FU.
 - The development proposed is 2 storey side extension, single storey rear extension, partial conversion of garage space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 2 storey side extension, single storey rear extension, partial conversion of garage space at 61 Darnley Lane, Colton, Leeds LS15 9EY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/03500/FU, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: SLP - Site Location Plan and 200 - As Proposed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one of four detached houses, 2 of which are single storey bungalows, accessed via a private drive parallel with Darnley Lane. There is a landscaped gap between the houses and Darnley Lane with hedgerows, trees and shrubs along the pavement edge. Consequently, the houses are set back further from the road than most other houses in the surrounding estate and are to some extent screened from it.
4. House sizes, design and orientation within the area vary but most are detached and constructed of redbrick with clay tiled roofs. They are set back from the road with

open front gardens or low hedge boundaries. Consequently, the estate has a verdant and open character.

5. Attached single storey garages to the side of houses are common within the estate and result in a wider gap between neighbouring houses at first floor level than ground floor level, as is the case with the appeal property and the neighbouring house, No 63. However, integrated garages with first floor accommodation above, such as in a row of properties close to the appeal site between Nos 37 and 45, and on several houses on cul-de-sacs branching off Darnley Lane, are also common.
6. The proposal includes a 2-storey side extension, part of which would be above the garage which would be converted into a store and utility room. It would be slightly set back from the front of the house and extend to the rear building line, with a single storey rear extension across the full width of the house. The council, in its officer's report, noted that the proposed extensions were proportionate and reflected the design of the host dwelling, but raised concern over the erosion of the gap between it and No 63.
7. Given the variation in design of the neighbouring houses on the private access, and the appeal property's set back position, the proposed extensions would not be obtrusive. Furthermore, houses on Kirkfield Drive form the backdrop to Nos 63 and 65 and fill the visual gap between them such that it is not a defining characteristic of this small section of road. In any case, a gap would be retained between the appeal property and No 63, albeit at first floor level it would be reduced. However, seen in the context of Nos 37 to 45, which similarly have accommodation above their garages as described, there would be no harm to the character of the surrounding area.
8. Although the proposed 2 storey extension would span most of the side of the house and the gable end would be wider than that at the front of the house, it would not be visible from most views within the street because of the relatively narrow gap between the host property and No 63. Therefore, despite it being bulkier than the existing garage there would be no visual harm to the character or appearance of the appeal property.
9. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or wider area and would not therefore conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), Policy GP 5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006), Policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide (2012) and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which require high quality design that respects the scale, form, detailing and materials of the original building and the character of the surrounding area.

Conclusion and Conditions

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
11. I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance. There is no indication that the proposed development would involve the removal of the rear garden boundaries. Therefore, the council's suggested condition preventing their removal or requiring their replacement with a 1.8m fence in the event of their removal is not necessary.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR