



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2025

by M Clowes BA (Hons) MCD PG CERT (Arch Con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3359186

1 Tranbeck Road, Guiseley, Leeds LS20 8LH

- 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 Hopkins against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/05935/FU.
 - The development proposed is 2 no. gable dormers to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in relation to this appeal is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Tranmere Park Conservation Area (TPCA).

Reasons

3. In accordance with the duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the TPCA.
4. The TPCA is characterised by high quality dwellings based in the Arts and Crafts style, that are typically set within spacious landscaped plots along curving tree-lined roads. It has a close connection to the surrounding rural landscape. These features create a pleasing, verdant, suburban character evocative of a garden estate.
5. The appeal site comprises a modestly scaled bungalow of simple detailing, with a large steeply pitched and unadorned roof slope to the front forming a distinctive feature. It forms a symmetrical pair with its adjoining neighbour and a further pair of semi-detached bungalows to the south-east. Being a short no-through road, with one other dwelling on the opposite side of the road, the pairs of semi-detached bungalows make a strong contribution to the character of the street scene. The Tranmere Park Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (TPCAAMP) identifies the appeal site as being within the first phase of development (1930's - 1940's), which was mainly populated by bungalows. Given these factors and notwithstanding the position of the dwelling towards the edge of the TPCA, the appeal site contributes positively to the character and appearance of the TPCA.

6. The TPCAAMP recognises that dormer windows are features used in traditional Arts and Crafts houses. Although present in the TPCA they are not a particularly dominant or frequent attribute. Where they do feature, they are typically located on detached dwellings. Whilst some are in keeping with the Arts and Crafts style from their minimal size and unassuming appearance, I observed that more recent additions are of a poorer design, greater scale and less refined detailing. Dormer windows are not a feature of the properties within Tranbeck Road.
7. There are positive aspects to the proposed dormer windows in that they would be 2 separate structures sited in line with the ground floor windows. However, they would be sizeable, with large cheeks to the sides covered in hung tiles and shallow pitched roofs that do not reflect the proportions of the host dwelling. In this regard the proposal would not reflect the guidance within the TPCAAMP which is clear that dormer windows reflecting the Arts and Crafts style should be modest in scale with lead or zinc for the side walls similar to that depicted in the accompanying image.
8. Whether or not it does not gain much vehicular or pedestrian traffic, the appeal site is nonetheless visible from within Tranbeck Road. It is also partially visible in views from Thorpe Lane, specifically the front roof slope of the host dwelling, despite the narrowness of the road and presence of hedgerows¹. The TPCAAMP identifies the view along Tranbeck Road as an important view and I observed that the style of the dwellings including the uninterrupted rhythm of the roof slopes, along with the verdant tree line at the termination of the road, were evident. In such views the proposed dormer windows would appear incongruous and out of scale, further unbalancing the symmetrical appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties the host-dwelling belongs to. Although the harm would be localised, such negative impacts can cumulatively erode the quality of the Conservation Area as a whole.
9. Even if I could accept the appellant's suggestion that the appeal site cannot be seen in public views, the crux of the issue is whether the proposal conserves or enhances the character or appearance of the TPCA. Given that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling, the adjoining semi and the wider street scene, it follows that the proposed development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the TPCA. The proposal would conflict with Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds Local Plan, Core Strategy (2014) and Policies BD6, BC7 and N19 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan) 2006. These policies taken together, seek to secure high quality design, the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment, and ensure that the scale, form and design of the development is appropriate to its context, including the character and quality of surrounding buildings.
10. Conflict would also arise with the statutory test and paragraph 210 of the Framework which indicates that development should sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
11. Furthermore, the proposal would fail to accord with the guidance in the Householder Design Guide (2012) which requires extensions and windows to respect the character, appearance and proportions of the original house. Similar

¹ As observed during my site visit and shown within the appellant's photographs submitted by email dated 29 March 2025.

conflict is found with the TPCAAMP in respect of advice regarding dormer windows as set out above.

12. In the words of the Framework the harm to the significance of the TPCA would be less than substantial, but nevertheless important, given the negative effect that would be exerted. Paragraph 215 of the Framework therefore directs me to weigh the identified harm against the public benefits of the proposal.

Heritage Balance

13. The development would result in an increase in accommodation at the host property. Whilst this would be of obvious benefit to the appellant in meeting the needs of his family, it would be a private rather than public benefit. There are likely to be other ways of achieving additional living space without causing the harm identified. No public benefits have been advanced.
14. Consequently, when giving considerable importance and weight to the special regard I must have to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the TPCA, I find that the harm arising from the appeal scheme, would not be outweighed by any public benefits.

Other Matters

15. The appellant suggests that the occupant of the adjoining semi-detached dwelling at No 3 Tranbeck Road wishes to erect an identical set of dormers to the front of their property which would reinstate any loss of symmetry. Be that as it may, whilst not doubting the adjacent occupiers intentions, there is no substantive evidence before me to confirm or ensure that a future development at the neighbouring semi would have a realistic prospect of being carried out, were this appeal to be allowed. This proposal has not been submitted as a joint or tandem planning application for identical development at the neighbouring site. Even then, I have found harm arising from the specific design and form of the proposal.
16. A number of dormer windows are depicted in photographs on the submitted plans but the circumstances around their existence, including whether they have planning permission, are not before me. Two of the examples appear to relate to detached dwellings and at least one, does not constitute an example of sympathetic development. The presence of unsympathetic development does not justify permitting new development that fails to take into account the specific context of the appeal site. No 30 Moorway is a detached dwelling and therefore the context is not comparable to the appeal site.
17. The lack of objections does not indicate support for a proposal. This does not affect my findings.

Conclusion

18. The proposed development would conflict with the aims of the Act, the development plan and the Framework. This is not outweighed by other considerations. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

M Clowes

INSPECTOR