



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by E Grierson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3364330

15 Heathfield, Adel, Leeds LS16 6AQ

- 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 Waqas Aslam against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00516/FU.
 - The development proposed is a new pitched roof to side forming first floor extension with dormer window to rear and roof light to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for new pitched roof to side forming first floor extension with dormer window to rear and roof light to front at 15 Heathfield, Adel, Leeds LS16 6AQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00516/FU, and the plans submitted with it, 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:

Location Plan;

Proposed Loft Conversion c/w Dormer 24173-1
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. In its processing of the application, the Council changed the description of the development from that entered on the application form. I am of the view that the appellant's original description was not sufficiently accurate or clear and therefore will adopt the Council's description in my decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a semi-detached bungalow situated on a sizeable plot within a well-established suburban residential area. At the time of my visit, the dwelling's habitable roof space was being extended through a hip to gable and rear dormer window enlargement. A replacement front dormer window and two front roof lights have also been installed as part of these works, whilst a single storey extension was largely complete at the rear.
6. Together with adjacent roads, Heathfield comprises of a wide variety of bungalows and two-storey houses, all set comfortably back from the highway within a verdant street scene. This assortment of house designs and sizes, including a range of extensions and associated roof forms, together with a sense of spaciousness, are defining characteristics of the locality.
7. I appreciate that the appeal bungalow was originally designed with a hipped roof and small sized front and rear dormer windows. The construction of the loft enlargement scheme as referenced above has however changed the shape and massing of the house's roof, and though these works have added considerably to its volume, their visual impact is mitigated by the dwelling's limited height, its shallow roof pitch and the presence of similar forms within the street scene.
8. The formation of the new gable end partly across the bungalow's width has an awkward relationship with the adjoining existing flat roofed side projection. By extending this gable fully across to the building's flank elevation, the appeal scheme would rationalise the building's form at the front, thereby enhancing its appearance to the street scene. Taking into consideration the extent of the loft extension already taking place, this further first floor element would represent a modest and suitably respectful addition to the roof's overall massing.
9. At the rear, the proposed dormer is of a lesser width but otherwise matching design to the dormer being built. Notwithstanding its box-like design, given the substantive changes to the bungalow which have already progressed as detailed above, this further enlargement would not be unsympathetic to its overall existing appearance. Furthermore, given the context of the wide range of building styles present in the area, including side gable ends and flat roofed dormers, I am satisfied that the appeal scheme would not appear incongruous through its scale and form and would not materially affect its varied, spacious collective character.
10. On this basis, I conclude that the proposed development would not lead to harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling nor the surrounding area. Although the appeal scheme would not wholly accord with Policy BD6 of Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006 (UDPR), which provides that all extensions should respect the scale and form of the original building, it would nevertheless satisfy the requirements of Policy GP5 of the UDPR and Policy P10 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 (as amended 2019). Taken together, these policies set out that development should resolve design as a planning consideration, including through being appropriate in size and scale to its context, in doing so respecting the character of surrounding buildings. Therefore, the proposed development is in accordance with the overall thrust of development plan policies.

Conditions

11. In addition to conditions related to the timeliness of the development and the identification of plans, a condition is necessary requiring materials to match those used on the existing house such to assist in the development's assimilation with the building.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

A Morrison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

E Grierson

INSPECTOR