



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

By S Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3363522

31 Breary Avenue, Horsforth, Leeds, LS18 5QH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Trifunovic and Chandler against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application reference is 24/07095/FU.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to the side and the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single storey extension to the side and the rear at 31, Breary Avenue, Horsforth, Leeds, LS18 5QH in accordance with the terms of the application reference 24/07095/FU, subject to the following conditions: -
 - (1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - (2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: PP-1360660v1 (location plan) and drawing No. 02 of Project No. 3067 (proposed plans and elevations).
 - 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.

Procedural Matters

2. There is a disagreement between the main parties as to which is the principal elevation of the house and therefore whether the proposed development includes a single storey rear or front elevation, plus in either case a wrap-around single side elevation. The difference is considered to be important in policy terms.
3. For the purposes of the appeal and for descriptive purposes, I have used that of the appellant, as contained in the application forms, though I have considered the merits of the proposed development both in terms of it including either a rear or front extension.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the impact of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The host property is a two-storey, brick built, end of terrace dwelling in a predominately residential area with a post and panel fencing to its side. What the appellant describes as the rear part of the proposed extension is an open paved area used for off-road parking, as are the adjoining spaces of the two other dwellings in the row, one of which is taken up by a single storey, domestic garage which extends to the highway edge of Back Brearly Avenue.
6. On my site visit, I was able to note that other properties on both sides of Back Brearly Avenue and in the vicinity of the appeal site include parking spaces and outbuildings of various kinds.
7. The proposed extension would include features of the host property including a double pitch roof of approximately the same pitch and would use materials to match. The extension would be comparable in terms of its height and scale to the existing domestic garage adjoining it, to which I have referred, but would have a lesser length than the latter, leaving space for the parking of a vehicle. .
8. I consider that, subject to a condition relating to external materials, the proposed extension would assimilate suitably with the character and appearance of the area which I have described, whether it is considered to include either a front or a rear extension.
9. In this regard, even if it were to be the case that the proposed development would include a front extension, the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD) considers that such extensions may be acceptable *'where the proposal will not harm the character of the locality'*.
10. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would accord with policies P10 and P12 of the Leeds Core Strategy (2014), its saved Unitary Development Plan 2006 policies GP5 and BD6, policy HDG1 of the SPD, and chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (as amended in 2025), all of which require development to be of good design which reflects that of the host property and which respects the character and appearance of the area.

Conditions

11. I have imposed the standard time condition and, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty, a condition relating to the approved plans. In the interests of good design, it is necessary to impose a condition relating to external materials.

Conclusion

12. There are no material planning considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR