



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 June 2025

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3364273

37 Hillside Avenue, Guiseley, Leeds LS20 9DH

- 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 Stuart Pearson against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00859/FU.
 - The development proposed is described as a retrospective application for a single-storey rear extension, hip-to-gable conversion, full width rear dormer and replacement front dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. I saw during my site visit, that the proposed development was nearly complete and I note that permission is sought retrospectively. I have dealt with the appeal accordingly, and on the merits of the appeal scheme.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Hillside Avenue is an established residential street of mostly semi-detached houses. The bungalows on the eastern side of the street, including the appeal property, are elevated above road level and so have increased prominence in the street scene.
5. Some of the houses in the street have been previously extended, including in the form of dormer windows and hip-to-gable extensions. Accordingly, even though the hip-to-gable roof extension has unbalanced this pair of semi-detached houses at roof level, it does not, of itself, look wholly out of place in the context of the wider street scene. Further, the front dormer window has replaced an existing dormer of a similar size and design and I note that the Council did not raise any specific objection to this element of the scheme.
6. However, the rear dormer window occupies nearly the whole of the extended rear roofslope and is not set down from the ridgeline. Its excessive size and box-like form is out of keeping with the form and proportions of the host building and, when viewed from the south, has created the impression of a flat-roofed storey at the rear. The effect is a scale and design of development which does not integrate sensitively with the host building, significantly harming its appearance.

7. The presence of a similar example at No 47 is not justification for further harmful development that would cumulatively erode the character of the area over time. Moreover, it may have been constructed under permitted development rights, which the appellant acknowledges is not an option for the appeal scheme.
8. In conclusion, I find that, as a result of the size and design of the rear dormer, the development has a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and its immediate surroundings. This is contrary to saved Policies BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds City Council Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) which require alterations and extensions to respect the scale and form of the original building, and be well designed generally. Similarly, there is conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (amended 2019) which requires, amongst other things, that new development delivers high-quality design that respects the character of its surroundings and contributes positively to place making.
9. As the rear dormer is not functionally severable from the other elements of the scheme, I am unable to issue a split decision.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with relevant policies of the development plan; therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR