



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2025

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3368119

42 Caxton Road, Otley LS21 3LL

- 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 David Firth against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00937/FU.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension at 42 Caxton Road, Otley in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 25/00937/FU, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Block Plan and Drawing 02.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The existing dwelling has already been significantly extended. It has a wide plot and sits comfortable in this corner position alongside its attached neighbour. Whilst the current front extension is prominent due to its depth, the two storey side extension follows the form of the original property design. The proposal would result in a single storey side extension of limited width, set back to the side. It would sit comfortably within the wide frontage of the property. Although extending close to the side boundary towards the rear, this would not be particularly evident from the street. Although the hipped roof would not match in terms of its pitch, it would nevertheless sit relatively unobtrusively alongside the existing extended dwelling. Given its scale and position, it would appear as a subservient and relatively modest new addition. As the property is set back from the road and it has a relatively high roadside boundary, it would have only a very limited impact on the wider area.
4. The council consider that cumulatively, along with the existing two storey and single storey side and front extensions, it would result in an unduly large mass of

extensions to the side of the original dwelling. Whilst the existing extensions do dominate the original form of the dwelling, this single storey side element would not result in a significant change to the development that has already been accepted. Its design and form would be appropriate in this particular context. It would not therefore result in harm to the character or appearance of the existing dwelling, its neighbour or to the wider area.

5. Given the above, the proposal would not be contrary to the design requirements of policy P10 of the Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) or policy BD6 of the Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006). Policy HDG1 of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012 requires that all extensions respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality, with particular attention being paid to the roof form and roof line. As the proposal has to be considered in the light of the previously accepted extensions, this further limited addition would not be at odds with the overall design objectives.
6. As the proposed extension would have a satisfactory appearance and as there are no other matters that weigh significantly against the proposal, I allow the appeal.
7. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and the details of the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. Drawing 02 sets out that the materials to be used would match the existing, so a condition in this regard would be unnecessary.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR