



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: 11th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3363418

22 Hillway, Guiseley, Leeds LS20 8HB

- 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 Jared Holgate against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/06616/FU.
 - The development proposed is described as loft conversion with Velux/rear flat roof dormer windows; forming 2no bedrooms and bathroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Tranmere Park Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the Tranmere Park Estate Conservation Area (the CA), which derives some of its special interest and significance from a high-quality range of housing based firmly on the Arts and Crafts style. 22 Hillway is a detached, two-storey dwelling that reflects this style and contributes positively to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset.
4. The CA Appraisal and Management Plan (2013) cautions that home alterations can potentially harm the distinctive architectural character of the area. It advises that dormer extensions should be modest and clad in lead or zinc.
5. The proposal includes three new flat roof dormers at the rear. Following a previous refusal by the Council, the design has been amended so that each dormer is now similarly sized and evenly spaced across the roof. Despite these changes, the dormers remain large, with bulky tile-clad cheeks, and collectively would occupy a large proportion of the rear roofslope. Additionally, their window openings would be noticeably larger than most of those on the floors below. As a result, the dormers could not reasonably be described as modest. Rather, they would appear visually dominant and out of keeping with the architectural character of the host building, thereby detracting from its overall appearance.
6. While the dormers would have limited visibility from public vantage points, they would be clearly visible from neighbouring properties. These perspectives still contribute to the overall character and experience of the CA. In these views, the dormers would appear disproportionate and out of keeping with the host building.

7. Overall, I find that the proposal would result in a harmful change to the host building and contribute to the incremental erosion of the distinctive architectural character of the area. The magnitude of harm can be classed as less than substantial in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Nevertheless, in the context of the CA as a whole, it would fail to preserve or enhance its character and appearance. This is a matter of considerable importance and weight.
8. The benefits of the scheme would be largely private, relating to improved accommodation and enjoyment of the property by its occupants. These do not outweigh the identified harm.
9. Thus, the proposal fails to satisfy the requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; parts 12 and 16 of the Framework; Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (amended 2019); and saved Policies N19, BD6 and GP5 of the Leeds City Council Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006), which require high quality design that conserves and enhances the historic environment and respects local character and distinctiveness.

Other Matters

10. Although the Council has approved other large format dormers within the CA, they are not widespread, and do not serve to justify this harmful proposal in the context of the special attention that must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA as a whole.
11. The effect on neighbouring living conditions was not a reason for refusal and does not need to be considered further in this decision given the appeal outcome.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with statutory requirements, the Framework, and the development plan as a whole. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR