
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025 by Andrew Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3366166

30 Holt Park Road, Adel, Leeds LS16 7QS

- 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 Ahmed against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01636/FU.
 - The development proposed is described as first floor front extension and PD dormer window to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 Matter

3. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the original application form. I note that the Council changed the description in its processing of the application to 'First floor extension to front; Alterations to doors and windows at front; Addition of a dormer with windows to rear', yet that its reason for refusal refers to the raising of the building's roof height.
4. The appellant states that the application does not propose a roof height increase, however this clarification is inconsistent with the submitted plans, which whilst do not show an increase in ridge height on the proposed side and rear elevations, do however show an increase on the proposed front elevation. I also note that the proposed first floor front extension is incorrectly shown on the proposed side elevation, and that the proposed rear dormer is missing from this same elevation. Notwithstanding these discrepancies, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the full extent of the proposed development as is shown on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the original property and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling with single storey front and rear extensions, situated on a suburban residential road of properties of similar design and scale. The houses along this section of Holt Park Road are notable for their

relatively consistent ridge height, whilst in common with properties in the surrounding area, their shallow roof pitches have meant the widespread retention of the buildings' original roof volumes.

7. The proposed raising of the house's ridge, as is shown on the proposed front elevation, would result in it being considerably higher than neighbouring properties to either side. This increase would appear as an incompatible alteration from a key visual characteristic of the street scene, and would result in harm to the appearance of the wider area.
8. The proposed rear dormer window has a box-like form and would extend across all the house's roof slope, thereby resulting in the equivalent of a three-storey scale at the rear. The enlargement would be of poor design owing to its dominant and bulky massing, resulting in a comparatively top-heavy appearance to the dwelling, thereby failing to respect the scale and character of the property. Furthermore, with no similar development of this nature in the area, it would be an incongruous extension with reference to the well-established character of the locality.
9. I note the appellant's comments regarding the right to extend the roof under permitted development. However, whether or not this may be the case taken in isolation, this element of the scheme nevertheless forms part of the wider application for which planning permission has been sought in this instance. Therefore, the planning merits of the roof extension fall to be assessed as part of the whole scheme on the basis that planning permission is required.
10. For these reasons, the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the original property and surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies GP5 and BD6 of Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006, which together explain that all extensions and alterations should respect the scale and form of the original building, in doing so resolving design as a detailed planning consideration. Furthermore, the development would fail to comply with Principle HDG1 of the Leeds Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012, which provides that extensions and alterations should pay particular attention to the roof form and roof lines of the main dwelling and the local area.

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge that the proposal would provide increased living space to meet the growing needs of a family. However, this would be a private benefit which would attract only very limited weight in support of the scheme and does not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the dwelling and area.

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 dismissed.

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 dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR