



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2025 by S Manson

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3372154

16A Sholebroke Avenue, Leeds LS7 3HB

- 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 Mrs S Parveen against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/03470/FU.
 - The development proposed is for a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure, Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal. Works have been carried out but not completed. I have referred to them accordingly. The main issue in regard to which is whether they would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Chapeltown Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

3. The appeal property is a large, three-storey red brick end-terrace, with the uppermost floor set within the steeply pitched roof space. It is a fine and largely unaltered example of late Victorian domestic architecture, distinguished by, amongst other things, its steep front gable. It forms part of a cohesive group of three similarly styled terraced houses, each maintaining an almost unbroken original roofline, preserving the architectural rhythm and uniformity of the terrace. This consistency in scale, form, and detailing plays a key role in sustaining the area's historic character and visual harmony, contributing positively to the significance of the CA.
4. The proposed dormer would occupy the entire width of the appeal building's roof slope and a large portion of its depth. The resultant development would be a large, boxy and dominant addition which would unacceptably erode the originality of the roof's shape and reduce the quality of the terrace's consistency. Though the dormer would use appropriate materials, it would not respond positively to the original architecture or roof form of the host building. The visual harm would be exacerbated by the misalignment of the proposed windows with the existing fenestration below, introducing an element of visual discord.
5. Although mature trees and landscaping would reduce the proposals visibility from public vantage points along Chapel Road, this would not diminish the importance of

the affected elevation to the character and appearance of the area. Moreover, the proposals would be visible to the rear of many neighbouring properties.

6. While dormer windows are visible in the surrounding area, they vary in age, design, and scale, and I do not have access to their full planning histories, so cannot confirm their planning status or the specific circumstances under which they were approved. Of the two cited examples, there are insufficient similarities with the appeal scheme to change my findings. The one at Number 63 Sholebroke Avenue is modest in scale and contemporary in design, mirroring the fenestration below. The other, outside this CA, was considered acceptable by an Inspector due to its retention of the original roof slope and its integration within a varied roofscape.
7. As a result of the above therefore, the proposals would harm the significance of the CA such that they would neither preserve nor enhance its character or appearance. The overall effect would be localised but noticeably impactful in perpetuity and thus, for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) at the upper end of less than substantial. The conservation of the heritage asset in this case (the CA) is a matter of considerable weight and importance. As per the Framework, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
8. It would increase living accommodation for the existing occupiers and although there would be some economic public benefit, during construction, this would be time limited in its effect. Ultimately, the mainstay of the benefits would be private. Therefore, the public benefits in this instance carry only very limited weight that would, by definition, be insufficient to outweigh the harm to the CA.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would conflict with Policies P10, P11 and P12 of the Core Strategy Selective Review Leeds Local Plan (2019), Policies BD6, GP5 and N19 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review) (2006) and guidance contained in the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012), and the Framework. Together, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and are acceptable for the historic environment.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposals would conflict with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR