



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2025

by **D Cleary MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3367388

86 Hawksworth Lane, Guiseley, Leeds LS20 8HE

- 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 Craig Barnett against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01115/FU.
 - The development proposed is described as two dormer windows to rear; rooflights to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two dormer windows to rear and rooflights to front at 86 Hawksworth Lane, Guiseley, Leeds LS20 8HE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01115/FU, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans referenced:

PL001 – Site Location Plan;

PL002 – Existing Plans;

PL003 – Existing Elevations;

PL004 Rev A – Proposed Plans;

PL005 Rev A – Proposed Elevations; and,

PL006 – Site Location Plan - Site Plan
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the banner above, and in my formal decision, I have used the description of development as detailed in the decision notice of the Council rather than that which is detailed on the application form. This is because it describes all of the operational development proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area, and whether it would conserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Tranmere Park Conservation Area (the TPCA).

Reasons

4. The site lies within the TPCA. The statutory requirement¹ requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. The Tranmere Park Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan 2013 (the CAAMP) provides a good understanding of the TPCA, its historic origins as a 20th century suburb, its characteristics and the features of importance. The CAAMP confirms that appeal site lies within a phase of development which was constructed between the 1950's and 1970's. Insofar as is relevant to this appeal the significance of the TPCA derives from the historic plan form and development resulting in pleasant streetscenes, along with the overall sense of uniformity, quality and detailing of the buildings.
5. The appeal relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with rendered elevations and light grey roof materials. The dwelling has been extended to the side and rear with single storey additions. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character. While dwellings in the area have some variety in detailing, there is a prevailing sense of uniformity which arises from their age and consistent use of materials. The dwelling and its semi-detached pairing, No.84 Hawksworth Road (No.84), are generally well balanced in form over two-stories, although the front and side single storey extensions to the appeal dwelling does dilute their overall sense of symmetry. The general consistency in appearance of the appeal site with other dwellings in the area means that I find it makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the TPCA.
6. The proposed dormer windows would be sited on the rear roof slope. The dormer windows would be set down from the ridge, up from the eaves and away from the sides of the roof. Furthermore, there would be a reasonable level of spacing between the two dormers. As such, much of the original roof slope would be retained and would be visible around the dormers. The generous off sets along with the modest scale of the dormers means that they would appear as well proportioned additions and would not dominate the roofscape of the host dwelling. Furthermore, the gable design of the dormers would draw appropriate reference from the gable design of the host building, while they would be vertically aligned with the openings below. Therefore, I consider that the dormers would appear visually harmonious with the host dwelling.
7. The rear siting of the dormers means that they would not be prominent from public vantage points, although there would be a glimpsed view between the property and No.88 Hawksworth Road. Notwithstanding this, the modest scale of the dormer which would be visible, along with the proposed off set from the side gable, would ensure that it would not appear dominant in this view. Any private views would be in

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

the context of the varied rear roofscape of the surrounding properties and, in this context, the dormers would not appear as prominent or incongruous features.

8. I acknowledge that there are no dormer windows positioned within the rear roofslope of No.84. The development would therefore imbalance the semi-detached pairing to some extent. Nonetheless, as I have observed above, the dormer windows are appropriately proportioned and would not dominate the roof, allowing for the original roof slope to be visually understood. This, along with their relatively discrete rear siting, would ensure that the character and appearance of the semi-detached pairing would not be unduly harmed.
9. I am also mindful that dormer windows are acknowledged as being characteristic to the TPCA and, on my site visit, I observed that there were a number of dormer windows within the surrounding area. Many of these are more prominently positioned on the front roofslope. The proposed dormers would be more discrete than these existing features and their introduction would not be uncharacteristic to the area.
10. The scheme also includes the introduction of two roof lights within the front roofslope. The Council have not raised any concerns with regard to this part of the scheme. The modest scale and unobtrusive nature of these interventions would ensure that they would not appear visually prominent. As such, I have no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusions in this regard.
11. Therefore, I find that the proposed development would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the TPCA and, therefore, it would not be harmful to the significance of the heritage asset.
12. For the reasons given above, the development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. It would also conserve the character and appearance of the TPCA. Therefore, the development complies with Policies GP5, BD6 and N19 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006); and Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy (Adopted 2014, amended 2019). Together, amongst other things, these require that development is of good design which respects the scale and form of the building, and which is in harmony with the area. They also seek to ensure that heritage assets are conserved.

Conditions

13. I have imposed standard conditions relating to the commencement of development, and to require compliance with the submitted plans for certainty. A materials to match condition is necessary in the interest of the character and appearance of the building and the TPCA.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR