



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3370920

40 Wynmore Avenue, Bramhope, Leeds LS16 9DE

- 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 B Smaldon against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application reference is 25/02353/FU.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor side extension with new first floor full length window, addition of single extension to rear incorporating parapet, new pitched roof to existing garage and addition of new canopy to front of dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance of the area; and the effect on the living conditions of the residents of 38 Wynford Avenue with regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. This is a large, detached property within a street of detached houses of varying designs and sizes. The proposal would add a hipped roof to the existing garage and a ground floor extension behind it. It would also provide an entrance canopy to the front. These elements are not identified as concerns by the council.
4. The proposal would alter the existing sloping roof to the side of the property to provide full height first floor accommodation. This would result in a matching gable to the rear and a matching roofline when viewed from the front, providing some symmetry to both elevations. The scale of these works would result in a substantial expanse of two storey development close to the boundary with 38 Wynford Avenue. The council consider that this would be overbearing for the neighbouring residents and that the design and scale of the works would harm visual amenity.

Character and appearance

5. The main central element of the house is two storey's and has a hipped roof. There are a range of elements that are attached to this and make up this large property. The large two storey element to the right-hand side is set back from the frontage but is nevertheless a prominent feature. The sloping roof to the left-hand side is flush with the frontage. These two elements do not currently provide a uniform appearance despite their matching materials. The proposal would provide some unity and symmetry to the frontage and the set-back of the first floor of the new side

addition would bring some relief to the frontage. Although the works would be of a considerable scale and would result in a house of significantly increased overall proportions, it is clear that the design of the front and rear elevations has been carefully considered. It would result in an improved appearance of the frontage overall, including the enhanced entrance feature. Although not appearing as a subservient addition to the main dwelling, the frontage of the house would appear as a more satisfactory whole, particularly as the rendered finish would ensure that the different elements would be indistinguishable from each other with regard to their materials.

6. Whilst the front and rear elevations would be improved, the works would result in a substantially greater bulk with regard to the side elevation. Although there would be some limited relief created by the front first floor corner being set marginally in from the front and side, this elevation would represent a large, two storey, relatively unrelieved elevation which would be close to the boundary. The position of the house, forward of its neighbour, would ensure that the full extent of this elevation would be visible from the road. Although street and garden trees would help to limit the prominence of this elevation, it would nevertheless be a substantial new element that would be clearly perceptible from public vantage points. The scale and lack of architectural interest in this elevation would represent poor design given the position of this elevation. It would be overly large and dominant and it would detract from the character and appearance of the area.
7. The council has raised concerns that the set back of the first floor element would not be sufficient to satisfy the Leeds Householder Design Guide (2012) and that there would be the prospect of a terracing effect given the proximity to the boundary. The step back would improve the existing appearance of the frontage and I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in a terracing effect given the deeper position of the neighbouring house. However, I am not persuaded that the proposal gains support from the guidance due to the design concerns relating to the side elevation.
8. Whilst elements of this proposal would result in some benefits, including the front elevation and the improvements to the garage and entrance, these are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that would result from the scale and detailing of the side elevation. Overall, the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area and the depth and detailing of the proposed side extension would represent poor design. It would therefore conflict with policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019); and policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review - 2006). It would also be at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework which is clear that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Living conditions of the residents of 38 Wynford Avenue

9. The greater scale of the side elevation would result in it being considerably more imposing when viewed from the neighbouring property. However, it would generally be to the side of that dwelling which does not have side facing windows; and from its driveway. Whilst the neighbouring residents would experience the unrelieved nature of the side elevation more than those viewing it from the road, it would not result in unacceptable harm to their living conditions. There would not therefore be conflict with the amenity requirements of the council's policies.

Conclusions

10. The proposal would not result in harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring residents. However, the side elevation would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and would represent poor design given the exposed nature of this part of the dwelling. The improvements to the frontage of the property would not outweigh this concern.
11. I have no concerns about the principle of a comprehensively well-designed new addition and I have had regard to the benefits of the improved accommodation and the investment required to achieve it. I am also mindful of the lack of objections and support offered locally.
12. I acknowledge that the neighbouring house has been substantially extended. However, the flank elevation of that property is not so clearly apparent. I have also had regard to the other approved extensions mentioned but must consider this proposal on its own particular merits.
13. Whilst there are matters that weigh in favour of the proposal, they are not sufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR