



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2023

by M Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/23/3324465

4 Hawksworth Lane, Guiseley, Leeds LS20 8HA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Hudson against the decision of Leeds City Council.
- The application Ref 23/02389/FU, dated 11 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2023.
- The development proposed is described on the application form as 'proposed roof gable and front dormer additions and rear single storey sun lounge'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed roof gable and front dormer additions.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the rear single storey sun lounge at 4 Hawksworth Lane, Guiseley, Leeds LS20 8HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/02389/FU, dated 11 April 2023, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and 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: Location Plan, Block Plan, and Plans and Elevations as Proposed received by the Council on 18 April 2023.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the rear single storey sun lounge hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, including the Tranmere Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a residential dwelling located on the northern side of Hawksworth Lane within the Tranmere Park Conservation Area (CA). The significance of the CA derives largely from the many high-quality dwellings in the arts and crafts style set within spacious landscaped plots which provides a pleasing, suburban character. The CA Appraisal¹ states that large mature

¹ Tranmere Park Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (May 2013)

gardens give the houses space and setting that adds considerably to the special character of the CA. The close relationship between the built form and the surrounding rural landscape is also a key characteristic.

5. The appeal property is a detached two-storey dwelling on a large plot and is set back from the road behind a hedge. The property is an attractive building, whose scale, form and design reflect the character of the CA. It includes a long sloping hipped roof which extends over the integral garage to the western side, a prominent first floor gable feature above the front entrance, large chimney stacks, small dormer windows to the front and eastern roof slopes and it is constructed in stone and render with a slate roof. The property sits comfortably on the plot and the generous gaps between it and those on either side, Nos 2 and 6, together with the fields opposite, results in a sense of spaciousness. Given these factors, the property positively contributes to the character and appearance of the CA. It is identified as a positive building in the CA Appraisal.
6. The proposal is to extend above the existing hipped roof to form a new gable end to the western side. A front dormer extension with a pitched roof would be erected to the extended roof slope and would include two windows. A single storey extension is proposed to the rear to create a sun lounge.
7. I have considered the effect of the scheme in the context of the obligations under the Act², which requires special regard to be given to the desirability of preserving the character or appearance of the CA. This is reflected in paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires that great weight be given to the asset's conservation when considering the impact of a proposed development on its significance.
8. Given the siting of the proposed single storey extension to the rear of the property, and its scale, design and the use of matching materials, it would not be prominent in the street scene and would be sympathetic to the property. I therefore have no reason to disagree with the Council's view that this element of the scheme would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.
9. The existing hipped roof is a distinctive and sympathetic feature which, due to its lower height close to the western boundary, ensures that there is a clear visual gap between the appeal property and No 6 and it therefore maintains the spacious character of the area. The gable end extension would result in the loss of the hipped roof and significantly increase the height of the roof on this side of the property. The increased bulk and massing of the roof would erode the visual gap between the appeal property and No 6 which would be readily apparent from Hawksworth Lane. The proposal would therefore reduce the sense of spaciousness in this section of the road.
10. Dormer extensions are not an uncommon feature of properties in the CA, but they are generally modest in scale and respect the overall style and materials of the main house. The proposed dormer is not of modest size. Due to its width, height and the extent of its projection from the roof, it would be a substantial addition which would dominate the front roof slope and compete with the existing gable feature rather than being subservient to it. The combination of the dormer and the gable roof extension would result in an incongruous form of development which would be at odds with the character of the property and the area, and would be harmful to the special character and setting of the CA.

² Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

11. The appellants have provided images of other extensions to properties in Tranmere Park. However, I do not have details of the planning history of these developments or the circumstances which led to their approval. Moreover, each inevitably has a surrounding context specific to it rather than to the appeal site. Accordingly, I have determined the appeal proposal on its own merits.
12. Framework paragraph 202 states that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimal viable use. The gable roof extension and dormer would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA.
13. The gable roof extension and front dormer would not require new foundations therefore having less environmental impact than a two storey rear extension, though this benefit would be very limited taking into account the scale of the development. The proposal would also provide additional living accommodation for the benefit of the occupants. However, this is not a public benefit and therefore carries limited weight. I do not find that there are any public benefits that would outweigh the less than substantial harm that I have identified.
14. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed gable roof extension and front dormer would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. This aspect of the proposals would conflict with saved Policies BD6, GP5 and N19 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006), Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (2019), Policy HDG1 of the Leeds City Council Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012), the CA Appraisal and the Framework. Amongst other things, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that alterations are of an appropriate scale and design to the existing building and the wider context, and preserve or enhance conservation areas. The proposal accords with these policies and guidance insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the proposed single storey rear extension. However, in relation to the proposed gable roof extension and front dormer the appeal should be dismissed.

Conditions

16. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. In relation to the single storey rear extension, I have attached the standard time limit condition and a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

M Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR