



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 March 2024

**by R Morgan BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 14 March 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3335845**

**17 Rutland Close, Woodlesford, Leeds, LS26 8LL**

- 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 D Flynn against the decision of Leeds City Council.
  - The application Ref is 23/02927/FU.
  - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

3. Rutland Close is formed of terraced twentieth century houses arranged in groups of four. The appeal property, 17 Rutland Close (No. 17) forms the end of one such terrace. Its position at a bend in the road means that the house is sited at an angle to both the street and the adjacent property, 19 Rutland Close (No. 19).
4. There is an existing two storey side extension at No. 17, which is set well back from the main front elevation, with a hipped roof to match that of the main house. The proposed development would extend the existing side extension forward, to fill the triangular-shaped gap which exists between the house and the driveway. The new extension would retain the hipped roof form, and would be constructed of materials to match the existing house. However, by extending out at an angle, the proposed development would look awkward, at odds with the simple, rectilinear form of the existing house and surrounding properties.
5. The proposed roof arrangement is not entirely clear from the submitted plans, but it appears that there would need to be a sizeable area of roof overhanging the angled front wall of the new extension. This would make the discrepancy in building lines more obvious, and would add to the contrived appearance of the proposed development.
6. Furthermore, the incorporation of a narrow window at ground floor level, with a larger opening above, would make the extension appear unbalanced. The proposed development would fail to reflect the pattern of fenestration in the

host property and surrounding houses, in which the upper and lower floor windows are the same size and fully aligned.

7. The corner location of the appeal property means that the extension would not be a prominent feature in the street, but even so it would be clearly visible. Owing to its angled form, overhanging roof and window arrangement, the proposed extension would appear as an unattractive addition which would detract from the character of the existing house.
8. I conclude that the proposed extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. As it would fail to respect the form of the original dwelling and the character of surrounding buildings, the proposed development would not comply with Policy P10 of the Core Strategy (amended 2019) or saved Policy BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP). Design considerations have not been resolved, so the proposal would also conflict with saved UDP Policy GP5.
9. Furthermore, the proposal would not comply with the detailed guidance for extensions and alterations contained in the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012, which requires that development respects the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and locality.
10. As it would not be visually attractive or sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment, there would also be conflict with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

### **Other Matters**

11. The appeal site is close to the boundary of the Woodlesford Conservation Area (CA). Having reviewed the plans and visited the area, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not cause harm to the setting of the CA. However, that does not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area identified above.
12. The Council has referred to Article 7 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, which requires an application for planning permission to be accompanied by any plans, drawings and information necessary to describe the development which is subject to the application.
13. In this case, the submitted plans are inconsistent in the way they show the roof being constructed, with the roof plan and side elevation drawings showing a higher ridge height for the extension than is depicted on the front elevation drawing. The treatment of the roof over the new angled wall is also unclear.
14. Even if I had found the proposal to be broadly acceptable in terms of its effect on the character and appearance of the area, without clear and unambiguous plans to describe the development, I would be unable to allow the appeal.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the reasons set out above, I have found that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance area. The scheme would conflict with the development plan and the Framework, and the submitted plans do not

clearly show the development to be undertaken. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

*R Morgan*

INSPECTOR