



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/25/3371906

93 Old Park Road, Gledhow, Leeds LS8 1DG

- 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 M Akmal against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02204/FU.
 - The development proposed is first story glazed extension to existing single storey extension. Replacement of roof tiles to whole roof with blue slate.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the first story glazed extension to existing single storey extension.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the replacement of roof tiles to whole roof with blue slate; planning permission is granted for the replacement of roof tiles to whole roof with blue slate at 93 Old Park Road, Gledhow, Leeds LS8 1DG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/02204/FU and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matters

3. The application made clear that the scheme had not been submitted retrospectively; however, I observed during my site visit that the replacement of roof tiles with blue slate had been carried out. I have dealt with the proposal accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The Council considered that the replacement of the roof tiles with blue slate is acceptable. I have no substantive evidence to lead me to a different conclusion upon this part of the development.
5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the first-floor glazed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and conservation area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a 1980's stone and rendered detached property, situated on a corner plot within a predominantly residential area, which has a verdant appearance with mature tree lined streets and mature landscaping within plots.
7. The site is within the Roundhay Conservation Area. In accordance with the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and

Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I am required to have special regard to the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the area. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposal on such an asset. This is irrespective of the level of harm.

8. From my observations, and considering the Roundhay Conservation Area Appraisal, the appeal site lies within an area where properties are set behind garden walls and tree lined verges. Properties also vary in terms of design and form; however, detailing reflects the age of the building, which adds to the significance of the conservation area.
9. The replacement of the existing first floor railings with a glazed extension would be a contemporary addition to the property. I observed during my site visit that, whilst a lightweight glazed feature, it would be clearly visible from multiple public vantage points.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to a contemporary building, Hollybank, 5 Gledhow Lane, Oakwood, which has a glazed box projection at first floor within the Roundhay Conservation Area. Whilst the details provided are limited, the building does not appear to be comparable to the site before me. Hollybank is a modern new build development; therefore, the glazed box feature reflects the age of the building.
11. The appellant has also drawn my attention to the approval of a contemporary extension to Grade II listed Micklefield House, located within the Rawdon Little London Conservation Area. However, the details provided are limited to plans and artists impressions. I acknowledge that the approved scheme is a contemporary addition to the listed building; however, I have not been provided with substantive details about the scheme, such as context, site specific matters, and the considerations given by the Council. As such, I give this limited weight. Notwithstanding this, each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal before me.
12. The appellant has provided a Heritage Appeal Statement prepared by Urban Glow Design & Heritage Ltd in support of the proposed development. The Heritage Appeal Statement highlights that the existing building on the appeal site forms a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and elements such as the first-floor railings could offer scope for enhancement.
13. Whilst modern features can be integrated with traditional design, due to the design and materials the first-floor glazed extension would be an unsympathetic addition to the appeal property, and incongruous to the area in general. I find that the first-floor glazed extension adds a discordant feature to the appeal property and the area in general by not reflecting the age of the property, resulting in less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area.
14. Paragraph 215 of the Framework states that where a development leads to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The appellant contends that there are several public benefits, including replacing unsightly railing with a high-quality structure; and by engaging local firms and tradespeople in the construction

process. Whilst the glazed extension may be high-quality, it is not sympathetic to the appeal site or area in general. In terms of engaging local firms and tradespeople, no substantive evidence has been provided to corroborate this. I find that there are no public benefits which would outweigh the harm caused by the first-floor glazed extension.

15. I find that the first-floor glazed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host property and conservation area. There is conflict with Policies P10, P11 and P12 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), Leeds Local Plan, Policies GP5, N19 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006) which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure developments are of good design, respect detailing and materials of the original building, are appropriate to the character of the area, and that the historic environment is conserved and enhanced to protect distinctiveness.
16. There is also conflict with the Framework, which seeks to ensure developments are of good design, appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings and heritage assets.

Conclusion

17. I find the proposed replacement of roof tiles to whole roof with blue slate is clearly severable both physically and functionally from the first story glazed extension to existing single storey extension.
18. I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the replacement of roof tiles to whole roof with blue slate. However, in relation to the first story glazed extension to existing single storey extension, the appeal should be dismissed.
19. Conditions relating to standard time limit for commencement of development, plans to be adhered to, and materials to be used are not relevant or necessary, as the replacement of roof tiles to whole roof with blue slate appears complete.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR