



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3371422

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 25/03215/FU.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side/rear extension, conversion of attic with raised roof height to form habitable rooms, roof light to front; removal of dormer to front, new dormer windows to front and rear; block up one ground floor window to rear; replacement of one ground floor window to rear with a larger window; new sliding doors to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application form identifies that works have commenced and not complete, during my site visit I observed that the works carried out are different to that of the proposal before me I have dealt with the proposal on the basis of the plans before me as opposed to works carried out, which I understand were the subject of a previous dismissed appeal¹.
3. The Council changed the description of development from that referenced in the application form. In the interests of clarity, I have adopted the revised description of development, omitting reference to works being retrospective.

Application for costs

4. An application for costs was made by Mr Stuart Pearson against Leeds City Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a modest semi-detached bungalow situated within a predominantly residential area. The appeal site is located at an elevated position in the streetscene similar to other bungalows on the eastern side of the street.

¹ APP/N4720/D/25/3364273

7. Many properties in the area have been historically extended or altered. The front dormer replaces a previous dormer of similar size and design, the roof light to the front is discrete in scale, I note that the Council did not raise any specific concerns about this aspect of the proposal, I agree.
8. The proposed development includes the removal of the newly created hip-to-gable roof extension. The proposal also includes raising part of the roof, the creation of an infill side extension with enlarged hipped roof which would force a reduction in size of the currently constructed rear dormer. Despite the changes the proposed development would retain a bulky appearance dominating most of the rear roof. The large box design extending from eaves to ridge would create a top-heavy form of development incongruous to the modest scale of the existing bungalow and streetscene in general.
9. During my site visit I observed other rear dormer additions in the immediate area which varied in scale and design. Nevertheless, dormers of a scale similar to the proposal before me were not common.
10. I find that the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. There is conflict with Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), Leeds Local Plan, and Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) which amongst other things seeks to ensure developments are of good design and appropriate to character of the area.
11. There is also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR