



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2025 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by Rachel Hall BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3373020

16 Springbank, Garforth, Leeds LS25 1DD

- 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 Christian Hunt against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/03307/FU.
 - The development proposed is removal of bay window to front; single storey side/rear extension; demolition of garage to side; re-positioning of entrance door; raised patio to rear with balustrade; new parking arrangement to front; re-roofing of existing property and removal of chimney; replacement windows and doors throughout.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for removal of bay window to front; single storey side/rear extension; demolition of garage to side; re-positioning of entrance door; raised patio to rear with balustrade; new parking arrangement to front; re-roofing of existing property and removal of chimney; replacement windows and doors throughout at 16 Springbank, Garforth, Leeds LS25 1DD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/03307/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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
Site Location and Existing Block Plan J25005 / A102 / Rev 2;
Proposed Block Plan J25005 / A115 / Rev 2;
Proposed Floor Plan J25005 / A110 / Rev 2;
Proposed Elevations J25005 / A111 / Rev 2;
Proposed Sections (sheet 1 of 2) J25005 / A112 / Rev 2;
Proposed Sections (sheet 2 of 2) J25005 / A113 / Rev 2, and
Proposed 3D Views J25005 / A114 / Rev 2
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan no. J25005 / A111 / REV2.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be inserted in the north side elevation of the extension hereby permitted.
 - 5) The extension and raised deck hereby permitted shall not be first used until the 1750mm high screen wall has been constructed in accordance with the

approved plans. The screen wall shall thereafter be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the extension and raised deck.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The dispute between the parties is limited to the side/rear extension. I see no reason to disagree with the remaining elements of the scheme which are not in dispute, and therefore my assessment will focus solely on this extension.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are;
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 14 Springbank, with particular regard to outlook and daylight.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

5. 16 Springbank is a detached bungalow set on a side sloping plot towards the end of a no-through residential road comprising of groupings of similarly designed bungalows and two storey houses. Some dwellings within the locality are separated by open sided driveways leading to set back garages, whereas others appear to have been extended to the side and some have car ports. Therefore there is variation in building layout and design that is appreciable from Springbank (the road). The streetscene nevertheless exhibits a positive degree of spaciousness, primarily resulting from the modest scale of its buildings and their positioning well back from the road.
6. The proposed replacement of the garage would remove a small amount of the existing driveway space. Nonetheless, the proposal would be of a limited width, maintaining the established gap to the side boundary with No 14. It would also be set appreciably back from the main gabled front elevation, thereby retaining the dominance of this feature. As a result of these modest proportions and its recessed position, it would not appear unduly prominent from the road. Consequently, when viewed in the context of other side extensions in the locality, the proposed side extension would sensitively assimilate with its surroundings and would not detract from the spacious character of the streetscene.
7. Therefore, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would thus satisfy the requirements of Policy P10 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 (as amended 2019) (the Local Plan) and Policies GP5 and BD6 of Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006 (the UDP). These policies mutually seek to ensure that proposals achieve good design, including through being appropriate in scale to the host building and wider setting. It

would also adhere to Principle HDG1 of the Leeds Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (the SPD), which advises that extensions should have regard to the scale and character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.

Living conditions

8. No 14 is set at a considerably higher floor level than the appeal property and is positioned a similar distance away from the shared side boundary as the existing garage and its proposed replacement extension. I observed that the rear elevation habitable rooms in this neighbouring dwelling benefit from good existing levels of outlook and daylight.
9. The extension would project deeper into the rear garden than the existing garage and would be taller than it. Nevertheless, the degree of separation between the proposed extension and the house at No 14, together with the substantially lower level of the appeal site relative to No 14, would minimise the effect of the proposal on outlook and daylight for the occupants of No 14. In addition, the proposed hipped roof design would result in the proposed roof sloping away from that side boundary. This would further limit the scale of the proposal as seen from No 14 to the extent that it would not appear unduly dominant or result in unacceptable shading of their habitable rooms or garden. No substantive evidence indicates otherwise.
10. The depth of the proposal would exceed the recommended 3 metre maximum projection along a common boundary as set out within the SPD. Nonetheless, the SPD describes this as a general rule of thumb and that level differences between neighbouring properties should also be taken into consideration. In this case, the outlook at No 14 over their good sized garden, and their relatively open aspect assisted by the existing change in ground levels, would not be unduly compromised by the proposal.
11. Therefore, for the reasons given I conclude that the proposal would be acceptable with respect to its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 14 Springbank, with particular regard to outlook and daylight. The proposed development would therefore satisfy the requirements of Policy P10 of the Local Plan and Policy GP5 of the UDP, which together seek to ensure that development protects residential amenity. It would also adhere to Principle HDG2 of the SPD, which provides general advice in the interests of protecting neighbouring occupiers.

Conditions

12. The Council suggested conditions in the event that the appeal were to be allowed and I have given consideration to these. Conditions are necessary to require that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in accordance with external materials as expressed on the plans. These are necessary for certainty and to promote good quality design that is sympathetic to its surroundings.
13. In order to protect neighbouring occupiers to either side of the site from undue overlooking, conditions are necessary to control the potential for further openings within the extension's northern side elevation and to ensure the construction and retention of the screen wall enclosing the southern side of the raised deck. The

suggested condition requiring the extension's side openings to be obscured glazed is not necessary given their position facing the flank elevation of No 14.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is allowed.

A Morrison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Rachel Hall

INSPECTOR