
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2020

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/20/3250510

82 Harrogate Road, Rawdon, Leeds LS19 6ND

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Oliver Walton against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/00173/FU, dated 12 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2020.
 - The development was originally described as "I have reconstructed my wall at the front border of the property and added a fence and gate to the entrance of my land."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a wall, fence and gates at 82 Harrogate Road, Rawdon, Leeds LS19 6ND in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 19/00173/FU, dated 12 January 2019, and the plan numbered TPC-OW-P-001.

Procedural Matters

2. The description in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. For the purposes of clarity, the development comprises a wall, fence and gates arrangement, and I have considered the appeal on this basis. This is reflected in my decision paragraph.
3. The development has already been carried out. Accordingly, I have also considered the appeal on a retrospective basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The development is located along the site frontage with Harrogate Road. The wall is constructed of a cream coloured stone. On top of the wall are narrow fencing panels consisting of grey painted timber infills that are set within a black steel frame. The vehicular access and pedestrian gates are constructed in the same materials as the fencing. The associated house and garage is set back from the frontage and the house is constructed of cream render and stone walls, with a grey slate roof. As I observed on my site visit, the front and garage doors are also now finished in grey.

6. In the vicinity of the site, there are a mix of front boundary treatments, including stone and hedgerows, as well as some fencing and brickwork. They are of a varying height.
7. The use of stone does not appear out of place with regard to the existing house, both in terms of the material and the light coloured finish. Where there is stone of a greyer hue in the locality, this appears more as a consequence of the weathering of an original lighter colour. The grey timber infill finish is in keeping with the colour of the garage and front doors on the house, as well as the roof. It fits in comfortably in these surroundings, even though it is a less common colour finish.
8. The height of the development is not dissimilar to, in particular the higher walls found in its vicinity. The frame arrangement at the top of the fence and gates is also not solid, and so this lessens the overall bulk and solid form to an acceptable degree. As such, and whilst it fully encloses the site frontage, this does not result in a fortress or industrial-like appearance. Most of the front boundaries near to the site are enclosed in some form and, as a result, the development does not unduly detract from an open character.
9. When these factors are taken together, the development does not constitute a dominant and incongruous feature in the streetscene. With regard to the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) where it cautions against erecting what it deems are large fences, walls and solid gates to the fronts of properties, the site is in a location which can ably accommodate this development. It is viewed as one of a number of different types of front boundary enclosure along this stretch of Harrogate Road and so it does not stand out to an untoward level. The adjoining frontage boundary treatments, along with the alignment of the road, also result in the views of the development being no more than localised.
10. I conclude that the development does not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. Hence, it complies with Policies P10 and P12 of the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), and with 'Saved' Policies GP5 and N25 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) which provide for good and high quality design; the protection of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes; resolving design as a detailed planning consideration; and, that boundaries should be designed in a positive manner appropriate to the character of the area.
11. It also complies with Policy HDG1 of the SPD which requires all alterations and extensions to respect the scale, form, proportions and the character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality, with particular attention paid to boundary treatments, amongst other matters. It also accords with the National Planning Policy Framework where it concerns achieving well designed places.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all matters that have been raised, the appeal should be allowed.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR